

Group *F0*
Class *406*
Piece *23*

22

Printed for the use of the Foreign Office. December 1905.

CONFIDENTIAL

(8561.)

F.O.

406



PART IV.

F.O. 406

23

FURTHER CORRESPONDENCE

RESPECTING THE

AFFAIRS OF ARABIA.

July to September 1905.

23

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
1	Sir N. O'Connor ..	442	June 27, 1905	Koweit ships at Bussorah. Probable that complaint of Koweitis respecting alleged discrimination shown by Turkish authorities against Koweiti ships unfounded ..	1
2	" ..	446	27,	Proposed establishment by Germany of coaling-station in Farsan Islands. Refer to No. 223, Part VI, Persia and Arabia. Two Germans left on one of the islands by German war-ship ..	1
3	" ..	447	27,	Yemen. Transmits despatch from His Majesty's Vice-Consul at Hodeida, reporting on military situation ..	2
4	" ..	449	28,	Yemen. Dispatch of arms and ammunition to ..	4
5	India Office	July 1,	British and French war-ships at Muscat. Transmits inclosure in Foreign Secretary's letter dated 25th May ..	4
6	To Treasury	6,	Muscat Arbitration. Question of gratuities to Messrs. Graham, Mounsey, and Craies ..	6
7	India Office	5,	Aden. Concurs in No. 84, Part III ..	6
8	To Mr. Mounsey ..	63	8,	Muscat Arbitration. Transmits copies of Argument ..	7
8*	To India Office	10,	Aden. Katuba boundary. Informs of Sir N. O'Connor's views respecting ..	7*
9	To Sir N. O'Connor ..	122 Tel.	11,	Aden. Refers to No. 79, Part III. Approves proposal to record settlement by exchange of notes ..	7
10	" ..	225	11,	Aden. Refers to No. 79, Part III. Concurs in proposal that settlement should be officially recorded ..	7
11	To Sir F. Bertie ..	475	12,	Aden delimitation. Inquiries to be made in deference to French complaint that line drawn near Sheikh Said ..	7
12	Sir H. Howard ..	123	11,	Muscat Arbitration. Transmits note (not printed) from M. de Ruysenaers, notifying Administrative Council of date of meeting of Tribunal ..	8
13	India Office	14,	Aden. Transmits inclosure in letter from Foreign Secretary, dated 8th June, relative to a hitch in concluding a Treaty with Beda in Aden Protectorate ..	8
14	Sir N. O'Connor ..	459 Confidential	7,	Ill-feeling against England among Turkish officials of Bussorah Vilayet. Transmits despatch from His Majesty's Consul. Attitude fostered by anti-British faction in Egypt ..	9
15	" ..	473 Confidential	10,	Anti-English agitation by Valis of Bagdad and Bussorah. Refers to No. 14. Transmits despatch from His Majesty's Consul at Bussorah reporting his warning to Moukhlis Pasha that he would be held responsible for any evil results ..	11

[1569]

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

iii

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
16	Sir N. O'Connor ..	478	July 12, 1905	Yemen insurrection. Refers to No. 3. Transmits despatch from His Majesty's Consul at Jeddah. Reports of revolt in Assir exaggerated. Rumour that Abha raided by Ahmad Ibn Aiz refers to Ibn ..	12
17	Treasury	18,	Muscat Arbitration. Refers to No. 6. Sanctions employment and allowance of Mr. Graham and fee of Mr. Craies ..	13
18	To Sir N. O'Connor ..	238	19,	Anti-English agitation by Valis of Bagdad and Bussorah. Refers to No. 15. Approves action ..	13
19	M. Pansa	17,	Arms traffic in Red Sea. Italian Ambassador at Paris instructed to join in representations to French Government ..	14
20	India Office	20,	Turkish post on Bubyen Island. Refers to Nos. 53 and 67, Part III. Transmits copy of letter from Major Cox reporting conditions on which Sheikh Mubarek would establish post ..	14
20A	To Sir F. Bertie ..	91 Africa	24,	Arms traffic in Red Sea. Transmits No. 19, and instructs accordingly ..	16
20B	Mr. Graham ..	1	24,	Muscat Arbitration. Transmits text of Supplementary Conclusions presented by French Government, with observations ..	17
21	To Sir F. Bertie ..	496	25,	Aden delimitation. Refers to No. 11. Relative positions of Sheikh Said and boundary delimited by Commissioners ..	18
22	Mr. Graham ..	2	25,	Muscat Arbitration. Refers to No. 20B. First meeting of Tribunal ..	19
23	India Office	28,	Alleged erection of guard-house from mainland opposite Bahrain. Transmits Secret letter from Government of India dated 22nd June ..	21
24	Sir N. O'Connor ..	501	24,	Military operations in Nejd. Refers to No. 40, Part III. Movements of Turkish troops ..	22
25	" ..	502	25,	Aden delimitation. Discrepancies between maps, &c., signed by British and Turkish Commissioners. Transmits despatch from Government of India of 29th June, inclosing letter from Captain Tandy ..	23
26	" ..	513	26,	Military operations in Nejd. Turkish troops advancing on Sana'a ..	24
27	" ..	514	26,	Yemen insurrection. Transmits Military Attaché's No. 46, reporting progress made in sending reinforcements ..	25
28	Mr. Graham ..	4	29,	Muscat Arbitration. Twelve copies of His Majesty's Government's reply to Supplementary Conclusions of French Government handed to Secretary-General ..	26
29	Sir N. O'Connor ..	108 Tel.	31,	Grand Shereef of Mecca. Choice rests between son or nephew of late Shereef and Hussein and Sadyk ..	26
30	To Mr. Graham ..	1	31,	Muscat Arbitration. Refers to Nos. 20B and 22. Approves proceedings ..	26
31	Mr. Graham ..	5	Aug. 1,	Muscat Arbitration. Second sitting of Tribunal ..	26
32	India Office	2,	Sari dhows. Transmits inclosure in Foreign Secretary's letter, dated 13th July. French Vice-Consul collected all old French flags and given out new ones ..	31

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
33	Mr. Graham	6 Confidential	Aug. 2, 1905	Muscat Arbitration. Refers to No. 31. No elucidation of last statement made by French Agent necessary. Court adjourned till final sittings	32
34	India Office	..	2,	Piracy in Persian Gulf. Transmits telegram from Viceroy of 22nd July. Pirate Ahmed-bin-Selman again abroad	32
35	" "	..	2,	Flagstaffs on Maklab Isthmus, &c. Refers to No. 56, Part III. Transmits telegram from Viceroy and proposed reply. Removal of flagstaffs on Sheep Island should be deferred	33
33*	" "	..	2,	Aden. Refers to No. 8*. Suggests notification to Porte respecting maintenance of pillars	33*
36	Memorandum by Mr. Fitzmaurice	..	3,	Aden delimitation. Comments on Captain Tandy's letter of 17th June, 1905	33
37	Sir A. Hardinge	139 Confidential	June 21,	Koweit Arabs in Persia. Conversation with Mushir-ed-Dowleh. Porte regards all Koweitis as Ottoman subjects	34
38	India Office	..	Aug. 5,	Arms traffic in Red Sea. Transmits telegram from Viceroy, dated 2nd August. Is there any objection to Resident at Aden visiting Berbera and Jibuti before making proposals for checking?	35
39	Mr. Graham	7	5,	Muscat Arbitration. Refers to No. 33. Second and third sittings	35
40	Sir N. O'Connor	521	July 31,	Disturbances near Tawarij. Transmits despatch from His Majesty's Consul-General at Bagdad. Incident closed	36
41	" "	525	Aug. 1,	Yemen insurrection. Refers to No. 26. Marshal Feizi Pasha, commanding troops in Yemen, appointed Acting Vali of province	36
42	Mr. Graham	8	6,	Muscat Arbitration. Refers to No. 39. Award to be delivered Tuesday	37
43	Admiralty	.. Confidential	7,	Rumoured intention of Germans to re-establish coaling-station on Farsan Island. "Perseus" reports no news of	37
44	Mr. Graham	9	8,	Muscat Arbitration. Transmits copy of Award	37
45	To India Office	..	9,	Turkish post on Bubyen Island. Refers to No. 20. Sir N. O'Connor not in favour of Sheikh of Koweit establishing post for some time to come	42
46	" "	..	9,	Aden delimitation. Discrepancies in maps. Transmits No. 25. No necessity for changes	43
46*	Memorandum by Mr. Fitzmaurice	..	8,	Aden. Maintenance of pillars, &c. Refers to No. 35*	43A
47	India Office	..	11,	Muscat Arbitration. Transmits telegrams to Viceroy of 9th and 10th August. (1) Informs of terms of Award; (2) requests observations on	43
48	Memorandum communicated to Musurus Pasha	..	12,	Alleged erection of guard-house opposite Bahrein. No such building erected	44
49	To Sir N. O'Connor	257	12,	Piracy in Persian Gulf. Transmits No. 34. Requests representations may be made to Porte	44

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
50	To Sir A. Hardinge	119	Aug. 12, 1905	Koweit Arabs in Persia. Refers to No. 37. Approves language	45
51	To India Office	..	12,	Flagstaffs on Maklab Isthmus. Refers to No. 35. Concurs in terms of telegram	45
52	Sir N. O'Connor	544	7,	Death of Grand Shereef of Jeddah. Refers to No. 29. Transmits two despatches from His Majesty's Consul at Jeddah reporting on	45
53	" "	547	8,	Yemen insurrection. Refers to No. 26. Transmits two despatches from His Majesty's Vice-Consul at Hodeida reporting arrival of troops for service in Yemen	46
54	To Treasury	..	14,	Muscat Arbitration. Question of remuneration of those concerned	49
55	To India Office	..	14,	Arms traffic in Red Sea. Refers to Nos. 80 and 81, Part III, and ante, Nos. 19 and 20A. Course proposed by Resident most desirable	50
55*	To Sir N. O'Connor	269	15,	Aden. Maintenance of pillars. Transmits Nos. 8*, 35*, and 46* for his views	50*
56	India Office	..	15,	Report that Sheikh of Bahrein had declared himself Turkish subject. Transmits inclosure in Foreign Secretary's letter, dated 13th July	50
57	" "	..	15,	Aden delimitation. Transmits inclosures in Foreign Secretary's letter, dated 13th July. Question as to whether Juban is within British sphere	52
58	To Attorney-General	..	16,	Muscat Arbitration. Thanks for services	56
59	To Mr. W. F. Craies	..	16,	Muscat Arbitration. Thanks for services	56
60	India Office	..	18,	Aden. Refers to No. 46. Concurs in opinion that no sufficient necessity for altering descriptions signed by Commissioners	57
60*	" "	..	19,	Bubyen Island. Opportunity of approaching Porte left to discretion of Sir N. O'Connor. Telegram to Viceroy respecting	57*
61	To Mr. Graham	2	21,	Muscat Arbitration. Refers to No. 44. Appreciation of services	57
62	" "	3	21,	Muscat Arbitration. Approves action reported in No. 42	57
63	To Professor Lammasch	..	22,	Muscat Arbitration. Thanks for acting as Arbitrator	58
64	To Mr. Lister	572	22,	Muscat Arbitration. Statement of French Minister. Status quo to be maintained till after arrival of M. Laronce	58
65	Sir N. O'Connor	565	19,	Trouble in Assir. Refers to No. 16. Much diminished. Needless to send more soldiers	58
66	To India Office	..	25,	Muscat Arbitration. Transmits No. 64. Status quo to be maintained pending return of M. Laronce	59
67	Sir N. O'Connor	574	22,	Yemen insurrection. Refers to No. 53. Transmits Hodeida, No. 94, reporting further progress of Turkish expeditionary force	59

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
68	India Office	Aug. 28, 1905	Special Koweit flag. Question fully discussed with Sheikh Mubarek ..	61
69	" "	29,	Proposed visit of Resident to Jibuti and Berbera. Transmits telegram to Viceroy of 17th August. Visit approved ..	61
70	" "	29,	Musandim flagstaffs. Transmits telegram to Viceroy of 16th August. Further consideration of question respecting Telegraph Island required ..	62
71	Sir N. O'Connor ..	118 Tel.	31,	Yemen insurrection. Entry of Turkish troops into Sanaa without opposition ..	62
72	Admiralty ..	Confidential	30,	Reported German coaling-station on Farsan Island. Transmits report from His Majesty's ship "Perseus." No sign of Germans ..	62
73	India Office	31,	Anti-British agitation at Bussorah. Transmits papers from Government of India ..	64
74	" "	Sept. 5,	Proposed coal depôt at Koweit. Transmits telegram from Viceroy of 30th August. Iradé issued continuing to British Companies coaling privileges at Bussorah ..	68
75	" "	6,	Muscat Arbitration Award. Concurs with Lord Lansdowne in accepting proposal of French Government to maintain the <i>status quo</i> until the return of M. Laronce ..	68
76	Sir N. O'Connor ..	609	5,	New Grand Sherref of Mecca. Refers to No. 52. Transmits Jeddah, No. 85, commenting on delay in appointment of ..	69
77	Sir F. Bertie ..	37 Africa	15,	Arms traffic at Jibuti. Transmits copy of note from M. Rouvier respecting. Governor of Jibuti has reported no case of smuggling ..	69
78	Memorandum communicated to M. Geoffray	18,	Muscat Arbitration Award. His Majesty's Government agree to maintenance of <i>status quo</i> pending arrival of M. Laronce. Final clause of the Award should come into immediate operation ..	70
79	India Office	19,	Aden boundary. Transmits telegram to Viceroy of 5th September. His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople concurs in view that Dthala Amir should keep up boundary pillars along Kataba frontier ..	71
80	" "	19,	Muscat Arbitration. Transmits telegram to Viceroy of 5th September. French Government request maintenance of <i>status quo</i> pending return of M. Laronce ..	71
81	Sir N. O'Connor ..	131 Tel.	23,	Red Sea piracy. Repeats telegram dated 23rd September sent to His Majesty's Consul at Hodeida. Pirate boats must be destroyed by His Majesty's ship "Fox" ..	72
82	" " ..	636	18,	Yemen insurrection. Refers to No. 71. Transmits Hodeida, No. 108, reporting on Turkish advance and reoccupation of Sanaa by Imperial troops ..	72
83	" " ..	637	18,	Babian Island. Turkish military post on. Has pointed out to Minister for Foreign Affairs that no effect has been given to representations regarding encroachment on rights of Sheikh of Koweit ..	73
84	To India Office	25,	Difficulties in Oman. M. Laronce instructed to cultivate friendly relations with British colleagues ..	74

No.	Name.	No.	Date.	SUBJECT.	Page
85	India Office	Sept. 25, 1905	French Vice-Consul at Muscat. Transmits letter from His Majesty's Agent at Muscat to the Viceroy, dated 17th July, regarding recent visit of Vice-Consul to Sür ..	74
86	" "	25,	Visit to Sür of French Vice-Consul at Muscat. Transmits copy of semi-official letter from Government of India to Major Grey, warning him not to interfere between French Consul and Sultan ..	75
87	Sir N. O'Connor ..	134 Tel.	28,	Red Sea piracy. Demands for destruction of pirate boats and for compensation have been settled satisfactorily ..	76
88	To Sir N. O'Connor ..	336	29,	Red Sea piracy. Conversation with Turkish Ambassador. Protested against action of His Majesty's ship "Fox" at Hodeida ..	76

CONFIDENTIAL.

Further Correspondence respecting the Affairs of Arabia.

PART IV.

No. 1.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received July 3.)

(No. 442.)

My Lord,

Therapia, June 27, 1905.

WITH reference to your Lordship's despatch No. 131 of the 25th April last, I have the honour to report that I instructed His Majesty's Consul at Bussorah to inquire into the case of the alleged discrimination shown by the Turkish sanitary authorities at that town against Koweiti ships, which had formed the subject of correspondence between the Government of India and the Political Resident in the Persian Gulf.

Mr. Crow reports that this matter was referred to Mr. Monahan by the Resident at Bushire on the 15th March last, and that Mr. Monahan, after making inquiries, replied that the sanitary authorities absolutely denied that any quarantine measures had been enforced against Koweit boats since the quarantine was officially removed on the 20th January, 1905. He also suggested to Major Cox that the nakhodas would do well to specify the cases of which they complained.

Mr. Crow states that he has no reason to doubt the truth of the assurances given by the Bussorah quarantine authorities, and is of opinion that the complaints of the Koweitis are unfounded.

I may mention that I referred the correspondence inclosed in your Lordship's above-mentioned despatch to Dr. Clemow, who has replied that the complaint of differential treatment has not been very clearly substantiated.

I have, &c.

(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

No. 2.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received July 3.)

(No. 446.)

My Lord,

Therapia, June 27, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 334 of the 6th September, 1901, relative to the wish of Germany to obtain the permission of the Porte to establish a coaling-station in the Farsan Islands, in the Red Sea, I have the honour to report that the Italian Chargé d'Affaires told me a few days ago that he had heard from his Government that a short time ago a German ship had anchored off one of the islands and landed two men, who had remained after the ship's departure. In reply to M. de Martino's inquiry whether I knew of any recent negotiations between the Ottoman and German Governments connected with these islands, I told him what I knew of Germany's wish to obtain a coaling-station, and of the refusal of the Sublime Porte to accede to it on the ground that compliance would open the way to a similar request from other Powers; I had, however, not heard that the German Embassy has recurred to the subject, but if I succeeded in getting any information of such a step, I would communicate it to him.

I am instructing His Majesty's Consul at Jeddah to inquire about the visit of the German vessel mentioned to me by M. de Martino, and to report anything he may learn, and I should be grateful for any information which the Admiralty may possess on the subject, and which would assist my confidential inquiries here.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

No. 3.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received July 3.)

(No. 447.)

My Lord,

Therapia, June 27, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 392 of the 6th instant, I have the honour to transmit herewith to your Lordship a copy of a despatch from His Majesty's Vice-Consul at Hodeida, reporting on the military situation in the Yemen.

Dr. Richardson reports that the military authorities have landed 6,345 troops of various kinds (viz., regulars, Redifs, and recruits) at Hodeida between the 30th May and the 12th June, thus bringing their actual strength in the field up to 40,000 men.

However, there is a continual wastage from sickness, sunstroke cases being very deadly.

The Commander-in-chief does not propose a forward movement until he has collected 3,000 camels and 3,000 mules for transport purposes, and it is not likely, owing to the present dearth of camels at Hodeida, that this concentration will take place very speedily.

Dr. Richardson also reports that the Imam of Sana'a has communicated with His Imperial Majesty by telegraph, with a view to a cessation of hostilities and that a Turkish officer has also proceeded to Sana'a on the matter.

The Turkish Reform Commission referred to in my despatch No. 258 of the 18th April is engaged in its work, and has dismissed Ibrahim Bey, the late Mutessarif of Hodeida.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

Inclosure in No. 3.

Vice-Consul Richardson to Consul Devey.

(No. 81.)

Sir,

Hodeida, June 12, 1905.

DURING the past month the dispatch of reinforcements to this province has been carried out very steadily, so much so that it has been possible to disembark 14,000 troops at Hodeida, together with a large number of transport animals and a considerable quantity of provisions and military stores.

Over 5,000 other troops have followed in the course of the current month, which would bring the total number of reinforcements landed since January up to 42,750.

After making a liberal allowance for casualties during the operations against the insurgents, and also deaths during the siege of Sana'a and desertions during and subsequent to the surrender of that town, I would estimate the present strength of the Turkish army in this vilayet at 40,000 roughly.

The Yemen force has suffered a loss of quite 20,000 men from all causes since the beginning of this year, or, more correctly, since the outbreak of the present rebellion.

Of two divisions of Syrian Redifs brought to this district, hardly two brigades now remain, in which every battalion is far below its original strength. I believe that it is intended to send these troops back to their country very shortly.

Since April the mortality at Menakha, where a big garrison is maintained, has ranged between twenty and thirty daily.

The Albanian and Anatolian soldiers at Hujjeila, Baha, and Bajal, en route to Menakha, have been equally unfortunate, and account for more than thirty deaths daily.

Cases of sunstroke occur to an alarming extent during the movements of troops, so much so that fourteen deaths in a single day from this cause were recorded among three

battalions that arrived recently from Prevesa, within a distance of four hours' march from Hodeida.

With reference to armament, the Turks possess eighteen mountain guns and twelve field guns at Hodeida that were recently landed, and four field guns at Menakha, exclusive of about six others stationed in the forts there. There are also two mountain batteries of six guns each at Taiz.

Although large quantities of provisions have arrived from Constantinople and other places, the big demands of the present force have nearly exhausted the stock of flour.

The question of transport between Hodeida and Menakha is one that has taxed the energies of the military authorities considerably for some time past, with no appreciable results. Owners of camels will not bring their animals to Hodeida, owing to the low rates offered as hire by the military, and the rough use to which they are subjected.

Native produce is thus prevented from being imported from the interior and foreign imports from being sent thither. Hides and skins and coffee in small quantities are in consequence taken to other ports along the littoral, and thence dispatched to Hodeida by means of sambocks. Dhurra, which is badly needed by the native population owing to the famine still prevalent throughout the plains, finds its way from here by sea to places near by along the coast, where it is met by camels that transport same to its destination.

The Commander-in-chief, I am given to understand, does not intend to make a forward movement before 3,000 camels and a similar number of mules are available for transport service with the troops.

Great difficulty is being experienced in collecting the camels necessary for the projected advance: the mules will be imported from Anatolia.

On the 8th instant Mahmoud Nedim Bey, the Adjoint of the Vali, left for Sana'a, it is believed to interview the Imam, and, if possible, arrange an amicable settlement.

There has been an exchange of telegrams between the Imam and the Sultan for some time past, with the result that Sheikh Mahomed Dalal, up to recently exiled to Rhodes but since permitted to return, of whom mention was made in my last report, and Mahmoud Bey have been ordered by an Imperial Irade to proceed to Sana'a, where the Imam has now arrived.

The hope is entertained generally that some understanding will soon be arrived at, dispensing with the necessity for further military operations.

Marshal Ahmed Fezi Pasha, who arrived here on the 5th instant to command the operations against the insurgents, is over 75 years of age, and it is not expected locally that much can be effected by him.

Rumours have been current for the past three weeks or more that the Turks had abandoned Kataba, owing to the hostility displayed by its inhabitants and the Sheikhs in the neighbourhood.

I now learn privately from a friend that there is no foundation in the above, although most positions and villages in the Kataba Caza have gone over to the Imam, with the exception of the town itself and one or two villages in its vicinity. The Kaïmakam of the above place is now at Aden, the reason for his presence there not being understood.

The Turkish Commission for Reforms in the Yemen has been engaged in its work, and has been directing its attention at Hodeida chiefly to the investigation of complaints by Arab Sheikhs and others against the officials in this Mutessariflik.

Ibrahim Bey, the late Mutessarif of this district was dismissed about a fortnight ago on the recommendation of Shakir Pasha, the President of the above Commission.

Rahimi Effendi, Secretary to the above body and a member of the same, who was formerly Chief of Correspondence at Hodeida and Kaïmakam of Kataba about three years ago, has taken over the duties of Governor of Hodeida temporarily.

Mahomed Rashid Pasha, the civil member of the Commission, was Mutessarif of Taiz from 1891-94.

The Commission will soon move to Menakha.

A court-martial under the presidency of Ferik Arif Hikmet Pasha has been sitting during the past week for the trial of officers and men in connection with recent surrenders of garrisoned towns.

It is stated that the Vali, Tewfik Bey, has tendered his resignation, and that either Marshal Ahmed Fezi Pasha or Shakir Pasha, recently promoted to the rank of Musheer, will succeed him.

There has been a good rainfall throughout the province, but famine still prevails in a severe form.

The new dhurra crop in the Tehama, that would have been ready for reaping in a month, has been totally destroyed by locusts.

Ship loads of grain and food-stuffs are pouring into Hodeida every week, the demand for which is daily increasing.

The want of camels to convey such into the interior is indeed great, owing to the Government seizing every animal available for military requirements.

With the exception of the import of dhurra, trade has been at a standstill for the past eight months, and perhaps never in a worse condition known in the annals of the vilayet.

The conditions of life at Hodeida are very bad, where the whole town is infected with Turkish soldiers, that hamper the operations of its bazaars, seize all the drinking water from the inhabitants, and are, in short, a general nuisance.

The authorities are helpless, and could not prevent the Albanian troops from landing recently and selling in the town about 5,000 kilog. of tobacco and a large quantity of spirits.

I have, &c.
(Signed) G. A. RICHARDSON.

No. 4.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received July 3.)

(No. 449.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, June 28, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to forward to your Lordship herewith, copy of a despatch from Lieutenant-Colonel Maunsell, Military Attaché at this Embassy, reporting on the dispatch of Mauser rifles and artillery material to the Yemen.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

Inclosure in No. 4.

Lieutenant-Colonel Maunsell to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 40.)

Sir,

Therapia, June 26, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to report that the Mahsusse steamer, "Izmir," left Constantinople two days ago with 10,000 Mauser rifles (large calibre), and the material of two batteries of field artillery for the Yemen.

The artillery hope to find the necessary horses and personnel at Hodeida on arrival.

These Mausers, with the 30,000 forwarded in the early part of the year, make a total of 40,000 sent to the Yemen.

I have, &c.
(Signed) F. R. MAUNSELL,
Lieutenant-Colonel.

No. 5.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received July 3.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of inclosures in a letter from the Foreign Secretary to the Government of India, dated the 25th May, relative to British and French war-ships at Muscat.

Copies have been sent to the Admiralty.

India Office, July 1, 1905.

Inclosure 1 in No. 5.

Major Cox to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

Bushire, May 6, 1905.

THE Political Agent advises the presence of a British man-of-war at Muscat, as French flag-ship will arrive there in a day or two. I concur. Perhaps the Naval Commander-in-chief can send His Majesty's ship "Sphinx," or some other ship from Bombay. No ship in the Gulf is at present available.

Repeated to Political Agent at Muscat, and to the Naval Commander-in-chief, East Indies, Bombay.

Inclosure 2 in No. 5.

Rear-Admiral Willes to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

Colombo, May 9, 1905.

PLEASE refer to the telegram from the Political Resident, Bushire. His Majesty's ship "Sphinx" will not be ready for sea until the 28th May. The "Redbreast" came to Bombay with an outbreak of beri-beri, and is undergoing disinfection. The "Fox" and the "Proserpine" are escorting destroyers to China, and the "Perseus," which is at Aden, is not available.

I consider it advisable that no British ship-of-war should meet the French flag-ship, as the Commander must be junior, and therefore take an inferior place to the senior French naval officer.

Inclosure 3 in No. 5.

Government of India to Major Cox.

(Telegraphic.) P.

Simla, May 11, 1905.

PLEASE refer to your telegram of the 6th May.

The following telegram, dated Colombo, the 9th May, has been received from the Admiral:—

"His Majesty's ship 'Sphinx' French Naval Officer."
Addressed to Major Cox, and repeated to Major Grey.

Inclosure 4 in No. 5.

Major Cox to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

Bushire, May 13, 1905.

PLEASE refer to your telegram of the 11th May, 1905, regarding man-of-war at Muscat.

Before receipt of it "Lapwing" had arrived at Bushire, and I had asked her to go on to Muscat if she had not other orders. She went accordingly.

The question of relative seniority with French officers has not presented difficulty in the past, and does not seem important now. The object of our sending ship-of-war is simply to stiffen Sultan with a sign of our vigilance and support. If, however, Admiral still thinks it undesirable for "Lapwing" to remain at Muscat, I request orders may be sent out to meet her at Muscat to return here or to Bahrain.

Repeated to his Excellency Rear-Admiral Atkinson Willes, Colombo, and to Major Grey.

Inclosure 5 in No. 5.

Major Grey to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

Muscat, May 19, 1905.

ON the evening of the 16th May the French flag-ship left for Sûr with the French Consul.

His Majesty's ship "Lapwing" is awaiting the orders of the Admiralty here.

No. 6.

Foreign Office to Treasury.

Sir,

Foreign Office, July 6, 1905.

WITH reference to your letter of the 1st March, and to previous correspondence regarding the Muscat Arbitration, I am directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to state, for the information of the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury, that it is necessary to appoint an Agent to attend the Tribunal which will meet at The Hague on the 25th instant, for the purpose of serving as an intermediary between the Court and His Majesty's Government.

Mr. Ronald Graham, a First Secretary in His Majesty's Diplomatic Service at present employed in this Office, has been selected for this appointment. Lord Lansdowne would propose, for their Lordships' consideration, that Mr. Graham should be granted a subsistence allowance of 30s. a-day during the term of his employment at The Hague, and that he should also receive his actual expenses of travelling and locomotion, together with the cost of a room for the transaction of official business.

Mr. G. A. Mounsey, a Third Secretary in His Majesty's Diplomatic Service, has been appointed Secretary to assist the Agent. As Mr. Mounsey is at present employed in His Majesty's Legation at The Hague no special allowances for accommodation or maintenance will, in his case, be necessary.

Lord Lansdowne desires to reserve, for future consideration, the question of granting gratuities to Mr. Graham and Mr. Mounsey in respect of their special services on this occasion.

It is desirable that Mr. W. F. Craies, who, as their Lordships are aware, has been retained for the preparation of the British Case, Counter-Case and Argument, should accompany the Agent to The Hague to act as Counsel. Lord Lansdowne would be obliged if the Earl of Desart would undertake, as in previous cases, to come to an arrangement with Mr. Craies as to the terms of his service. It has been suggested that Mr. Craies should receive a fee of 100 guineas, together with a subsistence allowance of 30s. a-day while absent from England and his actual expenses of travelling and locomotion.

I am to express the hope that the Lords Commissioners will take these proposals into favourable consideration and sanction the expenditure which they entail.

I am, &c.

(Signed) T. H. SANDERSON.

No. 7.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received July 7.)

Sir,

India Office, July 5, 1905.

I AM directed by Mr. Secretary Brodrick to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 23rd June, forwarding Sir N. O'Connor's proposals for placing officially on record with the Sublime Porte the settlement arrived at as to the frontier of the Aden Protectorate.

Mr. Brodrick concurs in Lord Lansdowne's proposal to approve the arrangement for an exchange of notes in the manner described by Sir N. O'Connor. He is also of opinion that, with regard to the frontier north-east from the Bana, it will be sufficient to insert in the British note a paragraph to the effect that the actual demarcation is postponed to a more favourable moment.

I am, &c.

(Signed) A. GODLEY.

No. 8°.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir,

Foreign Office, July 10, 1905.

WITH reference to your letter of the 8th June, transmitting copies of correspondence relative to certain proposals for the construction of permanent and more easily distinguishable marks of the Aden boundary line near Kataba, I am directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to forward herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State for India, copy of a despatch from His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople, containing his observations on the proposals in question.

Sir Nicholas O'Connor considers that it would be difficult to reopen with the Porte the question of the more effective demarcation of the frontier, and he prefers the course suggested in the letter from the Government of India of the 30th April, viz., that the Amir of Dthala should raise the height of those pillars along his frontier which require it, and at the same time clear away the brushwood round them and whitewash them.

Mr. Fitzmaurice, however, who, in accordance with his Excellency's suggestion, has been consulted by this Department, fears that any interference on the part of the Amir with the pillars will immediately result in his being accused by the Turks of tampering with the boundary.

Mr. Fitzmaurice also states that the distances between the pillars, as given in the letter from the Resident at Aden, dated the 18th January last, are incorrect, and that the pillars are much nearer to each other than is described. He has explained his views in a letter to the Government of India, which had not been received at the time when their letter of the 30th April last was written.

I am, &c.
(Signed) T. H. SANDERSON.

No. 8.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. Mounsey.

(No. 63.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, July 8, 1905.

I TRANSMIT to you herewith ten copies of the Argument on behalf of His Majesty's Government in the pending arbitration with the Government of the French Republic in regard to the grant of the French flag to Muscat dhows.*

One of these copies should be retained for your information, and the remainder communicated on the 10th instant to the Permanent Bureau. Of these nine copies, five are intended for the use of the French Government, one for the archives of the Bureau, and the remaining three for transmission respectively to each of the two Arbitrators and to the Umpire.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 9.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 122.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Foreign Office, July 11, 1905.

YOUR proposal to record the settlement of the Aden frontier by an exchange of notes is approved by His Majesty's Government, and the paragraph as to the undelimited part of the boundary north-eastwards, which you suggest in your despatch No. 396 A of the 10th ultimo.

No. 10.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 225.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, July 11, 1905.

I HAVE considered, in communication with the Secretary of State for India, your Excellency's despatch No. 396 A of the 10th ultimo, regarding the settlement of the Aden Protectorate frontier.

I concur in your proposal that the settlement should be placed officially on record by an exchange of notes with the Sublime Porte, to which would be attached copies of the maps, showing the frontier as traced by the Joint Commission, and of the *procès-verbal* signed by Mr. Fitzmaurice and the Ottoman Commissioner at Sheikh Saïd.

As regards the frontier north-east from the River Bana, it will be sufficient to insert in the British note a paragraph to the effect that the actual demarcation is postponed to a more favourable moment.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 11.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir F. Bertie.

(No. 475.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, July 12, 1905.

THE French Ambassador told me to-day that the French Government had been told that the Commission which had been delimiting the frontier of the Aden tribes had drawn the line quite close to Sheikh Saïd, and had arranged for the construction of a fort commanding the village of that name. His Excellency reminded me that it had

* Already printed.

been agreed that the line should keep clear of Sheikh Saïd. I said that his Excellency's recollection was correct, although we had not admitted that the French had any rights to that place. I would inquire whether the line had really been drawn in inconvenient proximity to Sheikh Saïd.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 12.

Sir H. Howard to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received July 13.)

(No. 123.)
My Lord,

The Hague, July 11, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 122 of the 10th instant, I have the honour to transmit herewith copy of a note which I have received from M. de Ruyssenaers,* notifying the Administrative Council of the Permanent Court of Arbitration of the date of meeting for the Tribunal in the matter of the Muscat Dhows Arbitration, and of the appointment of the British and French Agents, Counsel, and Secretaries.

I have, &c.
(Signed) HENRY HOWARD.

No. 13.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received July 15.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of inclosures in a letter from the Foreign Secretary to the Government of India, dated the 8th June, relative to a hitch in concluding a Treaty with Beda in the Aden Protectorate.

India Office, July 14, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 13.

Major-General Mason to Government of India.

(Confidential.)

Aden, May 13, 1905.

IN continuation of paragraph 2 of my letter dated the 7th instant, and with reference to the telegram from the Government of India of the 15th ultimo, to the address of the Government of Bombay, I have the honour to submit the following remarks in regard to the hitch in concluding a Treaty with Beda, which was last referred to in my telegram dated the 12th May, 1904.

2. In my telegram of the 12th May, 1904, it was reported that the Chief's cousin, who was the real Administrator and the *de facto* Ruler of the State, was apparently under some hostile influence, and would not come forward to make the desired Treaty, and up to the present there has been practically no further progress made towards overcoming that influence, or other motive, whatever it may be, which keeps this cousin of the Chief away from Aden.

3. From available information, it appears that the titular Sultan, Alawi-bin-Husen, is *non compos mentis* and an actual nonentity in the State, and there is little cause to doubt that any Treaty concluded with him would be valueless and only lead to friction and disputes amongst the tribesmen of the State.

4. The Sheikhs and heads of the Beda tribal sections undoubtedly look to and support the titular Sultan's cousin, Ali-bin-Ahmed-al-Rasasi, as the real *de facto* Chief of Beda, and it is his presence in Aden which is therefore required for the conclusion of any really satisfactory Treaty with the State.

* Not printed.

5. Hitherto he has rejected all overtures to enter Aden, and it is not possible to precisely state the cause. The negotiations of 1904 were mainly conducted through the medium of a certain well-to-do merchant, named Hajee Abdulla Am Uraigee, who owns property in Beda and in Aden, and it would appear that it was mainly due to certain suspicions entertained by Mr. G. W. Bury of the *bona fides* of this merchant and his relations that those negotiations somewhat promptly terminated, and have up to quite recently never been effectively renewed.

6. As to the suspicions entertained, there is practically nothing definite on the records of this Office; but, from inquiries made, I conjecture that they were probably in some way connected with the merchant's endeavour to arrange some stipulation in favour of himself and certain other merchants concerned for a reduction of the taxes and dues levied upon their goods in the Beda State.

7. As to whether the interruption of negotiations was in any way connected with the interests and general policy of the Abdali Sultan, it is difficult to make any more definite conjectures, although it may safely be assumed that the Abdali Sultan is averse to any measure which brings any other State into closer relations with the British Government, and renders his own less of a "focus" of hinterland affairs and politics.

8. Apart, however, from this cause of interruption, I have reason to believe that another cause has militated against the conclusion of the desired Treaty, which is in effect discussion amongst the Sheikhs and leaders of the tribal sections of the State itself as to the participation and distribution of the stipends and other monetary gains which are expected to eventuate from the Treaty.

9. Beyond this, my information is to the effect that Ali-bin-Ahmed-al-Rasasi is a man of some age and not of a nature disposed to accept more burden and responsibility, either now or in the future, that he can conveniently avoid. I am informed that, upon the death of the present titular Sultan, it will probably be Ali-bin-Ahmed's son, and not Ali-bin-Ahmed himself, who will be elected to succeed to the Sultanship.

10. It is quite possible, from a desire to avoid a source of friction with his tribesmen and a possibly considerable burden and responsibility, that a man of this nature has hitherto preferred the comparative ease of his present position on the fertile plateau of Beda to risking travel and adventure in the direction of Aden, and a probable interruption to the harmony of his existence.

11. At the present moment I am engaged in a resumption of negotiations through the same medium which was previously, as aforesaid, for no particularly definite reason, interrupted, with a view to, if possible, overcoming Ali-bin-Ahmed's reluctance to visit Aden, and otherwise, if possible, arranging for his son and some of the leading Sheikhs to come in his place armed with the Sultan's seal and letters authorizing them to sign a Treaty on his behalf, on similar lines to those last adopted in the case of the Treaty concluded with the Upper Aulaki tribe.

12. I trust that these negotiations may, in due course, be attended with success, or at least serve as a useful guide towards the adoption of some alternative line of action. The present disturbed condition of affairs in Yemen may, of course, prove a source of obstruction or delay. But I hope that, in the course of the next few months, it may prove possible to conclude this Treaty, and thus remove what Mr. Fitzmaurice refers to as the one serious gap in the north-east line.

No. 14.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received July 17.)

(No. 459. Confidential.)

My Lord,

Therapia, July 7, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 384 of the 3rd ultimo respecting the warning addressed by the Grand Vizier, in consequence of my representations, to the Valis of Bagdad and Bussorah cautioning them not to give credence and circulation to unauthenticated rumours inimical to England, I have the honour to transmit herewith copy of a Confidential despatch which I have received from His Majesty's Consul at Bussorah on the subject of the ill-feeling against England and the suspicion of her intentions which prevail among the Turkish officials in that vilayet.

Mr. Crow is of opinion that this attitude is deliberately fostered by an anti-British faction in Egypt, which has its head-quarters at Cairo, and disseminates mendacious

accounts of British operations in the Persian Gulf and North-Eastern Arabia through the medium of the Arab press.

I am transmitting copy of Mr. Crow's despatch to His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires at Cairo.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

Inclosure in No. 14.

Consul Crow to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 34. Confidential.)

Sir,

Bussorah, June 10, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Excellency's despatch of the 10th May last, concerning the anti-British feeling of the present Vali. He is, strictly speaking, the only Ottoman official of Turkish origin in the place. The other prominent members of the administration, civil and military, are all of Arab birth. It is noteworthy that two Valis in succession, Mustapha Nuri and Mukhlis Pasha, should have both been animated by the same hostile sentiments towards us. The Arabs are with us. Proximity to India and the many advantages arising from frequent commercial intercourse with Kurrachee and Bombay, cheap education, and the possibilities of finding employment in India for their sons, all tend to the development of a friendly spirit among the Arab population.

From inquiries I have made here it appears to me likely that Turkish ill-feeling and suspicion are deliberately fostered and encouraged by some external influence hostile to ourselves. I am informed that the anti-British faction in Egypt are active in disseminating through the Arab press mendacious accounts of our operations in the Persian Gulf and North-Eastern Arabia. The principal newspapers employed for this purpose are the "Alem Islami" and the "Liwa" belonging to Mustapha Kamil Pasha, and the "Muayed" belonging to Sheikh Al-Yusuf. All three are published in Cairo. I have not yet been able to secure copies of the articles referred to, but, if they are as represented, they must do us incalculable mischief. I have given directions for all numbers sent through the British Post Office here to be brought to me. It seems to be part of the Turkish intelligence system to collect all such information at a central department at Constantinople and to distribute it thence for the benefit of provincial Governors in Turkey. I am told there are special agencies employed for this purpose in Beyrout and Constantinople, and that Cairo is the head-quarters of this anti-British propaganda.

The hostile feeling has grown more acute recently in proportion as our activity in the Persian Gulf and Mesopotamia has increased. There has of late years been much coming and going of British officials. The Viceroy of India, accompanied by a British Minister and attended by a numerous retinue, has displayed to wondering eyes some of the pomp and magnificence of his high office. The Viceregal party visited Umkasr, and were visible to the garrison of the Turkish fort at that place. The Vali's secret agents reported the ovation prepared for them at Koweit and a certain obscurity regarding the object of their visit lent colour to exaggerated accounts of it, which lost nothing in the telling. Vessels like the "Renown" and the "Amphitrite," remarkable for their heavy tonnage and formidable appearance, have perambulated the waters of the Gulf and approached Turkish shores. His Majesty's ships take soundings uninvited in territorial waters and land parties for purposes of observation in remote corners: the "Investigator," of the Royal Indian Marine, lately surveyed the Koweit harbour for several months, and the hillside was dotted with their flags in conspicuous places. The Admiral of the East India Station has recently made a tour of the Persian Gulf, and his appearance in force at its head gives reasonable cause, in Turkish eyes, for the accounts of a naval demonstration. The Foreign Office at Simla last year dispatched a party of officials to travel through the land, in order to obtain information for a "Persian Gulf Gazetteer," and this apparently without intimating their intention to the Turkish authorities, and I now hear they contemplate sending another official to Bussorah, or Zobeir, or Suk-es-Shiyukh to complete their inquiries regarding Jebel Shammar, uncredited to, and unfurnished with, any permit from the Turkish Government.

I think our activity, supplemented by the slanderous newspaper work, to which I have referred, is quite enough to arouse Turkish suspicion and prejudice the Vali

against us. Our omission to ask leave for our survey and gazetteer excursions may doubtless annoy him. It is unfortunate, but I do not think it is unavoidable. Our intentions are presumably good, but our action is, I think, open to misconstruction.

I will take an early opportunity of conveying to the Vali the substance of the remarks contained in the last paragraphs of your Excellency's despatch.

I have, &c.
(Signed) F. E. CROW.

No. 15.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received July 17.)

(No. 473. Confidential.)

My Lord,

Therapia, July 10, 1905.

NEARLY a month before I spoke to the Grand Vizier, as reported in my despatch No. 384 of the 13th ultimo, respecting the anti-English animus exhibited by the Valis of Bagdad and Bussorah, I received from a confidential source copy of a particularly mendacious report sent to Constantinople by the Vali of Bussorah, ascribing to British intrigues many of the troubles with which the Turks have lately had to deal in North-Eastern Arabia, and accusing us of landing forces and erecting posts at various places in the Persian Gulf.

In ordinary circumstances it would not be worth while taking notice of reports of this kind, but as I had every reason to believe that similar imaginary accounts of our alleged intrigues were constantly being sent from Bussorah, and affecting the Sultan's feelings towards us, as well as rendering more difficult our relations with the Turkish Government both here and in the two vilayets above mentioned. I instructed Mr. Crow to let Moukhlis Pasha understand that we were not ignorant of his proceedings, and to warn his Excellency that if any evil results ensued we should hold him responsible.

From the inclosed despatch, in which Mr. Crow reports the conversation which he had with the Vali in pursuance of my instructions, your Lordship will see that, although the Vali ended by absolutely denying having sent the report referred to, he was obviously uneasy and anxious to avoid giving a direct reply.

I am informing Mr. Crow that I approve the language which he held to Moukhlis Pasha, as reported in his despatch.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

Inclosure in No. 15.

Consul Crow to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 35. Confidential.)

Sir,

Bussorah, June 14, 1905.

I CALLED on the Vali this morning in reference to the subject alluded to in your Excellency's despatch, Confidential, of the 10th ultimo. I told his Excellency that information had lately been given to the Sublime Porte about English interference and English intrigues in Arabia. There was no foundation for these reports, they were quite untrue. Wrong information had been given to his Excellency. It seemed that they wished to throw the blame on us for the unrest and troubles which had previously occurred in the vilayet. We were not to blame in the matter, but we were aware that the officials, both here and at Bagdad, desired to put the blame on us in order to conceal their own ill success in handling these matters. It would afterwards be understood that this information was untrue, and the truth would be made apparent. If evil resulted from these false reports we should not be responsible for it, but the responsibility would rest on this vilayet, and if trouble came we should have something to say about it.

The above is a literal translation of my remarks. The Vali, in reply, stated that he had now been here seven months, and during that time he had been frequently questioned by the Grand Vizier and the authorities at Bagdad in regard to alleged disturbances in

the sandjaks of Montefik and Amara. He had been in close correspondence with the officials in both places, and was convinced that there was no ground for these reports. He had communicated his conclusions to Constantinople, but had been told that he was wrong.

He had been directed to go to Montefik, and he had done so. He found that Hamid Pasha, Mutessarif of Montefik, had exaggerated the Sadim incident, and had quarrelled with Sadim Pasha and had abused his authority. He informed the Grand Vizier accordingly. He had then been asked by the Grand Vizier whether there was any foreign interferences in these places or in Nejd, and had replied that there was not and could not be, as no foreigners were resident there, and there were no foreign interests there.

I interrupted his Excellency to inquire whether officials here had not told him we were interfering and causing trouble. He evaded my question, and began to abuse the authors of the calumny, calling them traitors, liars, unclean beasts, mean creatures, and bad men.

I then asked him categorically whether he denied absolutely having sent in any report of the nature referred to. He assured me he had sent no such report, but, in reply to the Grand Vizier's questions, had stated that English intrigue was possible at Bussorah, as there were many English, but they were all much too busy with their commercial concerns to have time for anything else. He further stated that since his arrival he had seen no signs of English interference in the internal affairs of the country. As regards Koweit his Excellency said the subject was a troublesome one and a perpetual source of unrest to the people round about. Until the question whether Koweit belonged to Turkey or to England was settled he anticipated no relief from his anxieties in regard to it.

I replied that I did not think the subject need worry him, as it had been under the consideration of the Sublime Porte, and an understanding concerning the whole matter had been arrived at between the two Governments, according to which the present situation was to be maintained. I explained to him that our main political problem in these parts was the protection of the approach to India, and that, in order to counteract any hostile intentions on the part of foreign Governments in reference to that country, we had concluded arrangements with neighbouring Powers, such as Turkey and Persia. The Koweit arrangement was of this category.

In conclusion his Excellency said that the reports of which I had complained emanated probably from Bagdad, and he would do all he could to throw light on the subject, so that the authors might be punished. He said he would be happy to renew the discussion whenever I desired, and I told him that I would convey his remarks to your Excellency.

I have, &c.
(Signed) F. E. CROW.

No. 16.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received July 17.)

(No. 478.)

My Lord,

Therapia, July 12, 1905.

WITH reference to Mr. Consul Devey's despatch No. 64 of the 10th ultimo, sent direct to your Lordship, and to my despatch No. 447 of the 27th June, I have the honour to transmit a further despatch from Mr. Devey, stating that there were grounds for suspecting that the reports of the revolt in Assir have been somewhat exaggerated, and that the rumour that Abha had been raided by Ahmad Ibn Aiz probably refers to Ibh, a town of secondary importance in the Yemen.

A telegram I have received from Mr. Devey to-day states that two brothers of Ahmad Ibn Aiz and fifty followers have been killed or captured.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

Inclosure in No. 16.

Consul Devey to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 71.)

Sir,

Jeddah, June 17, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 64 of the 10th instant, there are grounds for suspecting some exaggeration in the report of the revolutionary movement of Assir Arabs; while most probably the telegram therein quoted referred to some place of secondary importance, Ibh in Yemen, and not to Abha, which is some 150 miles west of Comfidah. Turkish Government reports, just received from that port, would show that there were no very serious occurrences up to the 10th instant, but that supplies of various grain, flour, &c., had been received and forwarded, though further consignments of sugar were still needed. Withal this, bazaar rumours continue to maintain stoutly that serious insurrection has begun in Assir.

I have, &c.
(Signed) G. P. DEVEY.

No. 17.

Treasury to Foreign Office.—(Received July 19.)

Sir,

Treasury Chambers, July 18, 1905.

IN reply to your letter of the 6th instant, I am to request you to inform the Marquess of Lansdowne that the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury sanction the appointment of Mr. Ronald Graham (1st Secretary in His Majesty's Diplomatic Service, at present employed in the Foreign Office) as His Majesty's Agent to attend the Muscat Arbitration Tribunal, which will meet at The Hague on the 25th instant.

My Lords agree to the proposal that Mr. Graham should be granted subsistence allowance of 30s. a-day during the term of his employment at The Hague, and that he should also receive his actual expenses of locomotion, together with the (vouched) cost of a room for the transaction of official business.

With reference to the penultimate paragraph of your letter, I am to signify their Lordships' approval of the offer of a fee of 105*l.* to Mr. Craies, and to the grant to him of subsistence allowance of 30s. a-day while absent from England, together with his actual expenses of locomotion.

I am, &c.
(Signed) G. H. MURRAY.

No. 18.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 238.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, July 19, 1905.

I HAVE received your Excellency's despatch No. 473, Confidential, of the 10th instant, regarding the mendacious report sent to Constantinople by the Vali of Bussorah, ascribing to British intrigues many of the troubles with which the Turks have lately had to deal in North-east Arabia.

Your action in the matter, and the instructions which you sent to His Majesty's Consul at Bussorah, have my approval.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 19.

M. Pansa to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received July 20.)

(Translation.)

My Lord,

Italian Embassy, July 17, 1905.

ON the 20th June last, your Lordship desired me to ascertain whether the Italian Government were willing that the British and Italian Ambassadors at Paris should take steps simultaneously to call the attention of the French Government once more to the question of the arms traffic in the Red Sea, especially with regard to the exportation of arms from Djibouti to the Arabian coast, whence they are re-imported into Africa, the branch of this traffic which has given the greatest trouble.

I have now the honour to inform your Lordship that my Government, to whom I hastened to communicate the proposal, have, in accordance with the wish expressed by your Lordship, given instructions to the Italian Ambassador in Paris to decide upon the manner in which the fresh representations should be made to the French Government in consultation with his British colleague.

I have, &c.
(Signed) PANSA.

No. 20.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received July 21.)

Sir,

India Office, July 20, 1905.

WITH reference to Sir E. Gorst's letter of the 22nd May, and to my letter of the 31st May, on the subject of the Turkish post at Bubyen Island, I am directed by Mr. Secretary Brodrick to request that you will inform the Marquess of Lansdowne that the Government of India have now replied to his telegram of the 31st May,* in which they were instructed to ascertain what support it would be necessary to afford to the Sheikh of Koweit to enable him to establish a post on Bubyen, in the event of such a step being rendered necessary by the failure of the Turkish Government to comply with a request for the withdrawal of their post from the island.

Major Cox has reported the conditions on which Sheikh Mubarek would be ready to take this step, and a copy of his letter is attached.

With regard to the first condition mentioned in the Government of India's telegram, Mr. Brodrick apprehends that no difficulty arises, as Sir N. O'Connor has already informed the Turkish Government that His Majesty's Government reserve the Sheikh of Koweit's rights to Bubyen Island.

The only point of difficulty in the second condition appears to Mr. Brodrick to be the proviso that the Political Agent should be maintained at Koweit on a practically permanent footing.

As Lord Lansdowne is aware, Mr. Brodrick proposed, in my letter of the 2nd June, 1904, to appoint an officer as Political Agent at Koweit, and Captain Knox was appointed to that post after the concurrence of the Marquess of Lansdowne had been duly received.†

The intention of the Government of India was that the appointment should be permanent, but from Sir E. Gorst's letter of the 26th October, 1904, it appeared that Lord Lansdowne adhered to the view stated in his despatch to Sir N. O'Connor, No. 234 of the 20th August, 1903, that it would be better to "avoid raising a difficult and inconvenient question with the Turkish Government by appointing a British officer to reside permanently at Koweit." The Government of India were accordingly instructed in Mr. Brodrick's despatch of the 11th November, 1904, and Captain Knox left Koweit in the early part of the present year.

If, then, the Turkish Government are unable to give a satisfactory reply to the question which it is proposed, in Sir E. Gorst's letter of the 22nd May last, to instruct Sir N. O'Connor to address to them as to the withdrawal of their post from Bubyen, it will be necessary to review this decision before any announcement can be made to the Porte that His Majesty's Government intend to arrange for a Koweit post on the island. It will be observed that Major Cox expressed to the Sheikh his belief that

* Telegram from Viceroy, June 26, communicated to Foreign Office, June 27, 1905.

† Sir T. Sanderson's letter, dated June 21, 1904.

15

the British Government would inform the Porte that they had recognized the Sheikh's claim to Bubyen, and had advised him to institute a post on the island. I am to inquire whether this statement is approved.

Mr. Brodrick assumes that the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury would be prepared to pay a moiety of the financial assistance which the Sheikh would require.

Mr. Brodrick proposes, with reference to the final paragraph of Lord Curzon's telegram, to sanction the deputation of Major Cox to Khor Abdulla, with a view to the selection of posts, should the occasion arise.

I am, &c.
(Signed) A. GODLEY.

Inclosure in No. 20.

Major Cox to Government of India.

(Confidential.)

Sir,

At Sea, June 11, 1905.

IN accordance with the instructions conveyed in your telegram dated the 5th instant, I have consulted Sheikh Mubarek, and now have the honour to report the result.

2. In the first place the Sheikh stated that the idea of his maintaining a post on Bubyen Island commended itself to him very much, but that he could not venture to carry out the proposal if he had to take upon himself the undivided onus, or odium, which such a move would involve. He continued that he had already suffered so much from the retaliative amenities of the Turks, alike in connection with—

- (1.) The imprisonment of his Agent;
- (2.) The arrest of his friends;
- (3.) Interference with his Fao property and the murder of his employés;

that he naturally hesitated to give them any excuse for further reprisals.

If, on the other hand, it was quite understood, as I assured him I believed to be the case, that the British Government were prepared to inform the Porte that they recognized his claim to Bubyen, and were advising him to institute, or supporting him in instituting, a post or posts on the island, then he said that he, Sheikh Mubarek, was only too glad to carry out the project.

3. Asked what form and amount of assistance he would require from Government, he replied—

- (a.) That we should maintain a Political Agent at Koweit (*i.e.*, as a practical permanency), who would give him support and advice;
- (b.) That Government should occasionally send a man-of-war to Koweit, and up the Khor Abdulla;
- (c.) That Government should, if there was no objection, bear the cost of the erection of guards' quarters (estimated at 500 rupees) and their maintenance (at 100 rupees per mensem).

4. At this juncture I produced the chart, and discussed with the Sheikh the strength and position of the post. As to strength, he expressed the opinion that ten men would be sufficient for one guard, and at any rate not more than twenty. As to position, he strongly advocated three blockhouses, not one only. (At this point I beg reference to the "Sphinx" survey of the Khor Abdulla.)

Sheikh Mubarek considered the most important position on Bubyen to be the most easterly point of Rasal Geit, apparently about 1½ miles north-east of the present Turkish "storehouse." He regards this as strategically the most desirable site, because the Khor Sabiya not being navigable on an ebb tide all craft proceeding in the direction of Zobeir must pass up the Khor Abdulla, and a post at Rasal Geit will be palpable to all.

The second post he agrees might be on the most north-easterly point of Bubyen, south of the eastern extremity of Warba Island, which he also claims to be his. The third position, to which he also attaches special practical importance, would be the Jeziret-es-Sooof, or "Wool Island," one of the islands in the creek almost due east of Umkasr post, and probably the island shown on the top margin of the "Sphinx" survey.

Sheikh Mubarek declares that to this island especially his claim cannot be

disputed, for it has been used from time immemorial, and still is, as a depôt for wool under export from the hinterland, and that all the wool merchants from Koweit proceed there regularly at certain seasons.

I informed the Sheikh here that I had only been instructed to discuss Bubyah with him, and in that connection one post on the north-east of the island, to balance the Turkish posts at Umkasr and Al Geit. He begged me, however, to communicate his complete views to Government.

5. As a matter of fact, instead of threatening to support Sheikh Mubarek in maintaining a post at the north-east end of Bubyah to balance the two Turkish posts, would it not be possible, and at the same time more effective and more logical, to threaten them with a blockhouse opposite Al Geit and another opposite Umkasr, on Soof Island, to balance their two posts? In this latter connection I asked Sheikh Mubarek whether the location of the Turkish and Koweit posts, within range of sight and rifle shot of one another, would not lead to friction. He replied that this would not be in the least likely, for, as it was, the Turkish guards at the two existing posts were constantly so much on their beam ends that they were frequently dependent on his people for the necessities of life, and this would always be the case.

6. In the concluding sentence of the Foreign Department telegram under reply, I gather that my views are asked especially as to—

- (1.) The support which it would be necessary for us to give Mubarek.
- (2.) The complete reservation of the right to send an agent to Koweit from time to time.

With regard to (1), Sheikh Mubarek did not make the slightest hint to me in the direction of a subsidy, and I imagine that he suggested our defraying the small estimated cost of erection and maintenance (i.e., 500 rupees for building and 100 rupees per mensem for the upkeep of each post), more because the payment would give Government a direct interest in the project, than that the refund of the money was any object to him. Mubarek has, however, suggested on one or two previous occasions that a subsidy would be acceptable to him, and if the present proposals take shape, perhaps the occasion would be considered a suitable one for starting such a subsidy.

With reference to (2), Sheikh Mubarek, as I have mentioned above, stated, without hesitation, as the first condition on which the undertaking could be put in hand, that the British Government should keep an Agent permanently at Koweit. Apart from this, I venture to state that, when reading the opening words of the Secretary of State's telegram in the present connection, the first thought that struck me was that it seemed a pity that the opening of negotiations with regard to Bubyah should be admitted in any way, as between us and the Turkish Government, to hinge on the temporary absence or withdrawal of our Agent from Koweit. But possibly I have misinterpreted the sentence, and His Majesty's Government have no such intention.

7. In conclusion, I beg to observe that it is difficult for me to advise satisfactorily as to the best position for a post or posts without acquainting myself roughly with the features of the ground on the spot; and it also seems important that the "Jeziret-es-Soof," mentioned in paragraph 4 above, should be identified and reported on. I did not think it prudent to proceed there, however unobtrusively, without reference to Government; but if there is not considered to be any objection thereto, it would be convenient if I could be informed accordingly by telegraph.

I have, &c.
(Signed) P. Z. COX.

No. 20 A.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir F. Bertie.

(No. 91. Africa.)
Sir,

WITH reference to my despatch No. 77, Africa, of the 20th June respecting the measures to be taken for the suppression of the traffic in arms at Jibuti, I transmit herewith a translation of the reply which I have received from the Italian Ambassador to my note of the 20th June,* suggesting the advisability of further

* No. 19.

representations being made to the French Government with regard to the export of arms from Jibuti to the opposite Arabian coast for re-exportation to Africa.

Your Excellency will perceive that the Italian Government concur in my suggestion that further joint representations should be made on the subject.

I have accordingly to request you to consult your Italian colleague as to the manner in which these representations should be made, and to inform me of the result of your action in the matter.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 20 B.

Mr. Graham to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received July 25.)

(No. 1.)

My Lord,

The Hague, July 24, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to transmit to your Lordship herewith the text of Supplementary Conclusions presented by the French Government to the Muscat Arbitration Tribunal. These conclusions were communicated to me by the French Agent this afternoon, and did not reach me till 5.30 P.M.

Your Lordship will observe that the French Government base their action, which is contrary to the provisions of Article II of the "Compromis" of the 13th October, 1904, on the consideration that, whereas the French conclusions were merely a résumé of contentions already advanced, the British argument was, in reality, a new Counter-Case, into which fresh facts and arguments had been introduced. France has therefore found it necessary to enter a reply.

I have ascertained from the Secretary of the Tribunal that the French Supplementary Conclusions had not reached him before he closed the Tribunal this afternoon. They cannot therefore be handed to the Arbitrators until the Court meets to-morrow morning at 11 A.M.

The unexpected action of the French Government creates a situation which was not contemplated in my instructions. It is, moreover, impossible for me to ascertain your Lordship's wishes as to the attitude I should adopt before the Tribunal meets.

The matter appears, however, to be primarily one for the decision of the Tribunal. In the circumstances, I propose, when the Court meets to-morrow morning, to take no action until I have ascertained the attitude of the Arbitrators. They may decline to accept the Supplementary Conclusions. In the event of my being consulted, I propose to draw attention to the irregularity of the French procedure on this occasion, to state that I have referred the matter to your Lordship, and to request that the consideration of the question may be postponed pending the receipt of your instructions. Should the Court decide to accept the conclusions, I will make a full reservation of the right of His Majesty's Government to reply, under Article III of the "Compromis."

I have examined, with Mr. Craies' assistance, the French Supplementary Conclusions as carefully as the short time at our disposal permits. Beyond certain statements, unsupported by documentary evidence, regarding the alleged grant to Suris of Zanzibar flags, they do not appear to contain any fresh points of fact of any importance, nor are they likely to materially assist the French, or affect the British, Case. Copy of a Memorandum by Mr. Craies on this subject is herewith annexed.

Moreover, had the French Government requested permission to submit these Supplementary Conclusions to the Court, it is probable that His Majesty's Government would not have objected, subject to a full reservation of their right to reply.

I would venture to submit, for your Lordship's consideration, that, subject to such a reservation, I might be authorized to agree, if the occasion arises, to the submission to the Tribunal of the French Supplementary Conclusions, in spite of the belated and irregular manner in which they have been presented.

I have, &c.
(Signed) RONALD GRAHAM.

Inclosure 1 in No. 20 B.

Supplementary Conclusions presented by the French Government to the Muscat Arbitration Tribunal.

[Not printed.]

Inclosure 2 in No. 20 B.

Memorandum by Mr. Craies.

THE Supplementary Conclusions are a belated attempt—

1. To meet the arguments in the Counter-Case;

2. To reply on the British Argument;

3. To allege that the latter creates *faits nouveaux*.

But it carefully avoids any argument as to the Articles, and avoids giving any evidence in support of them.

p. 5. As to allegation on p. 5 as to Treaty of 1844.

Great Britain in the Argument has followed the terms of Article III, paragraph 3, of the "Compromis."

* The argument as to the Treaty of 1844 is not new. (See British Case, pp. 7, 11.)

The reference to the Treaty in the Argument is directed to the contention that the Treaty is *res inter alios acta*.

The British Argument is not a *fait nouveau*.

p. 7. Completely misconstrues the letters referred to in Appendix 2 (p. 40) of Counter-Case. This is clear from Government of India's telegram of the 23rd July, 1903.

p. 12. This merely admits and explains the different texts.

p. 17. This is dealt with above.*

p. 19. Explanation should be asked as to these *titres*.

They may be only clearances.

p. 21. Appears to be based on a misunderstanding of the decision in the gun-running case. (Counter-Case, p. 34.)

p. 22. This misconstrues the British Argument, which is that no custom or usage in Zanzibar since 1856 can affect the Sultan of Muscat.

p. 25. The theory is accepted by Ferand Giraud. The régime seems to be claimed to protect Russians, Belgians, and Mussulmans. It is not stated who explained to the Sultan the régime in question.

p. 29. There is nothing new in this, except the text of Lord Canning's Award, which we also had brought over, in Aitchison.

p. 35. The statement as to Ali in the British Argument is supported by documents. The new statements by France are not. But the matter is trifling.

p. 37. The coaling station question was introduced by France in her Case.

p. 39. No proof of alleged statement of Sultan as to Debai; but it is immaterial.

No. 21.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir P. Bertie.

(No. 496.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, July 25, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 473 of the 12th July, respecting the inquiries made by the French Ambassador as to the proximity of the Aden frontier line to Sheikh Saïd, I transmit herewith, for your Excellency's information, a copy of a Memorandum and map which I handed to M. Cambon to-day in explanation of the relative positions of Sheikh Saïd and the boundary recently delimited by the Commissioners.

I am, &c.

(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 22.

Mr. Graham to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received July 26.)

(No. 2.)

My Lord,

The Hague, July 25, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to report, with reference to my despatch No. 1 of yesterday, that the first meeting of the Muscat Arbitration Tribunal took place at 11 o'clock this morning.

Besides the three Arbitrators, Messrs. Lammasch, Savornin Lohman, and Chief Justice Fuller, and the British and French Delegates, there were present His Majesty's Minister, Sir H. Howard, and nearly all the other Diplomatic Representatives at The Hague, who constitute the Permanent Administrative Council of the Court of Arbitration.

M. Lammasch, as President of the Tribunal, opened the proceedings in a brief speech. He referred eloquently to the progress of the idea of arbitration for the settlement of international difficulties, expressed his appreciation of the honour done to himself and to his colleagues by their selection as Arbitrators on the present occasion, and welcomed the British and French Delegates. He then declared the Court open.

A recital followed of the names of the Secretaries appointed to the Tribunal, Messrs. Ruysenaers (the Secretary-General), Roell, and d'Hauteville, and of the British and French Delegates.

M. Ruysenaers then rose and referred to the French Supplementary Conclusions which had been received by the Court this morning, and on which I had the honour to report to your Lordship yesterday. It appears that the French Agent, finding the Court shut yesterday afternoon, had forwarded copies of these Conclusions direct to the three Arbitrators, an irregular proceeding, as all such communications should have been made through the Secretary-General.

The President inquired whether the British or French Agent had any observations to make as to the submission of the Supplementary Conclusions to the Tribunal and whether there was any objection to their being accepted.

I had prepared a brief statement on the lines indicated in my despatch of yesterday, which I proceeded to read to the Court. I urged that, in view of the unexpected nature of the action taken by the French Government, I should be given an opportunity of consulting your Lordship before the Tribunal arrived at any decision in the matter. I trust that the terms of this statement, copy of which is inclosed, will meet with your Lordship's approval. It seemed desirable to draw attention, in a friendly manner, to the irregularity of the French proceeding and to meet the objections to the form of the British Argument, which they adduced as the reason of their unexpected action.

The Arbitrators retired to deliberate. After an absence of 20 minutes they returned, and their decision, copy of which is annexed, was read out by the Secretary. It was to the effect that, in view of Articles XLII and XLIII of The Hague Convention, the Court has decided to accept the French Supplementary Conclusions, but reserved to His Majesty's Government the right to reply either before or on the 1st August next.

M. Lammasch then referred to the question of the language to be used before and by the Tribunal. He stated that the Court had decided that French and English might be used concurrently during the sittings, as had been already agreed, but that the *procès-verbaux* and sentence would be drawn up in the French language, with an official English translation. I inclose copy of this decision.

At about midday the President declared the Court adjourned to Tuesday next, the 1st August, at 11 A.M.

Copies of the *procès-verbaux* of the meeting will be forwarded to your Lordship as soon as they reach me.

In my despatch of yesterday I stated the opinion that the French Supplementary Conclusions, which have now been accepted by the Tribunal, in spite of the belated and irregular manner of their submission, do not materially assist the French or affect the British Case. A further examination of the documents in question confirms this opinion. The new facts or arguments it contains can easily be met, and a reply should be prepared, as soon as possible, dealing very briefly with the questions raised, but adducing no fresh facts, and giving the French no handle for the submission of further conclusions. The last word in the controversy will thus

rest with His Majesty's Government, and the incident of the Supplementary Conclusions, disclosing, as it does, a certain nervousness on the part of the French and dissatisfaction with their own as compared with the British Cases, cannot but create an impression on the Tribunal, and react in our favour.

I propose, subject to your Lordship's approval, to return to London to-morrow night with Mr. Craies. I would suggest that a Conference might be held on the following day, the 27th instant, at which a draft reply, now in course of preparation by Mr. Craies, might be considered. It is evident to me, from certain remarks made by the Arbitrators, that they are anxious to bring the proceedings to an early conclusion, and that they desire that our reply should be very brief, and should be submitted as soon as possible.

I have endeavoured to ascertain whether oral arguments will be necessary. The question will not be definitely settled before the meeting of the 1st August next, but I gathered, in the course of private conversation with M. Savornin Lohman and M. Ruyssenaers, that the Arbitrators are satisfied with the written Cases, and that it is extremely unlikely that oral arguments will be required.

I have, &c.
(Signed) RONALD GRAHAM.

Inclosure 1 in No. 22.

Statement by Mr. Graham.

THE French Supplementary Conclusions were communicated to me yesterday evening.

This is essentially a friendly arbitration, in which His Majesty's Government desire to meet the objections or wishes of the French Government in the most friendly spirit. But the action of the French Government in submitting Supplementary Conclusions on the day before the Tribunal meets has come as a complete surprise, and appears to be in contradiction with Article II of the "Compromis" of October 1904, which stipulates that the Argument or Conclusions should be submitted within one month of the delivery of the Counter-Cases, unless the period is extended by mutual consent of the Contracting Parties. The Tribunal may, under Article III, call for further statements, but I am not aware that it has done so on this occasion.

The British Argument was drawn up in full conformity with the provisions of Article II of the "Compromis," and is in the form adopted on previous occasions in the case of similar Arguments. It was of necessity somewhat elaborate, in view of the quantity of new matter imported into the French Counter-Case.

The Argument has been in the possession of the French Government for a fortnight, but it was not until yesterday that we had any indication that the French Government objected to its form or desired to submit Supplementary Conclusions to the Tribunal.

I have referred to my Government for instructions, and would respectfully submit to the Court that the consideration of the question should be deferred for a few days until I can receive a reply.

Inclosure 2 in No. 22.

Decision of Arbitrators.

VU les Articles XLII et XLIII de la Convention de La Haye du 29 Juillet, 1899, pour le règlement pacifique des conflits internationaux.

Le Tribunal a admis le dépôt des Conclusions Complémentaires présentées au nom du Gouvernement de la République Française, et réserve aux Représentants du Gouvernement de Sa Majesté Britannique le droit de répondre soit avant, soit à la séance de Mardi, le 1^{er} Août, 1905.

Inclosure 3 in No. 22.

Statement by M. Lammasch on the Language Question.

LA langue du Tribunal sera le Français.

Toutefois, conformément à la décision prise par les deux Parties intéressées, et communiquée au Tribunal par les Ministres de France et d'Angleterre à La Haye, en date du 13 Mai dernier, les Parties auront le droit de se servir des langues Française et Anglaise concurremment au cours des débats.

Quant aux procès-verbaux et la sentence, ils seront rédigés en Français, mais accompagnés d'une traduction officielle Anglaise.

No. 23.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received July 29.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a Secret letter from the Government of India, dated the 22nd June last, regarding the alleged erection of a guard-house on the mainland opposite Bahrein.

India Office, July 28, 1905.

Inclosure 1 in No. 23.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

Sir,

Simla, June 22, 1905.
WITH reference to your Secret despatch dated the 31st March last, we have the honour to forward a copy of a letter received from the Political Resident in the Persian Gulf, submitting a Report by the Political Agent at Bahrein in respect to the complaint made by the Turkish Ambassador on account of the alleged erection of a guard-house on the mainland opposite Bahrein.

2. It will be observed that there is no foundation whatever for Musurus Pasha's statement.

We have, &c.
(Signed)

CURZON.
KITCHENER.
E. R. ELLES.
A. T. ARUNDEL.
H. ERLE RICHARDS.
J. P. HEWETT.
E. N. BAKER.
C. L. TUPPER.

Inclosure 2 in No. 23.

Captain Trevor to Government of India.

(Confidential.)

Bushire, May 27, 1905.
WITH reference to your letter dated the 26th April last, I have the honour to forward, for the information of the Government of India, a copy of a letter which I have received from the Political Agent, Bahrein, on the subject of the alleged building of a guard-house by the British naval authorities opposite Bahrein.

2. Captain Prideaux' Report explains the matter fully, and it is unnecessary to comment beyond remarking that the complaint made by the Turkish Government is as baseless as their other recent complaints.

Inclosure 3 in No. 23.

Captain Prideaux to Political Resident, Bushire.

Bahrein, May 19, 1905.

IN reply to your letter dated the 12th May last on the subject of two communications made by the Turkish Ambassador in London to His Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, complaining of the erection of variously described buildings in the vicinity of Bahrein but on Turkish territory, I have the honour to report that no such infringements of Turkish rights have been in any way committed.

2. The complaint probably is founded on one or more of the three following incidents:—

(1.) In February last, after completion of the nautical survey of Khor Kaliya, the Commander of His Majesty's ship "Redbreast" caused a cairn or beacon to be built in the sea near Muharraq Island for the guidance of navigators entering the harbour.

(2.) In March, the Commander of His Majesty's ship "Redbreast" laid out a rifle-range and erected a stop-but on the sandy desert at the south end of Sitra Island, one of the Bahrein group, east of and adjacent to the chief island on which Manama is situated. In the construction of this range no efforts were employed to give it a permanent character; but in a rainless climate such as Bahrein has there is little doubt that the range will last for many years. No objections were raised by Sheikh Isa in this connection. On the contrary, he deputed an official to attend the camp and render all necessary assistance to the officer conducting the musketry practices.

(3.) In February also, when I heard that an infantry detachment was on its way to Bahrein to act as Political Agent's guard, I commenced building a guard-room of the ordinary pattern close to the main entrance of the Agency house and within our own grounds. A barrack-room has still to be built, and for this the Chief has granted an additional site adjoining the west side of the Agency wall.

3. These are the only cases in which His Majesty's naval officers or myself have been connected with the construction of new buildings this year. The Victoria Memorial Hospital was started last year, and cannot have any connection with this complaint.

4. I am inclined to think that the Turkish Ambassador, and possibly the Wali of Bussorah, too, have received indistinct accounts of recent events here, i.e., the visit paid to Bahrein by His Majesty's ship "Fox," "Sphinx," and "Redbreast," the arrival of the Agency guard, and the construction of the Sitra rifle-range; and that the whole have been now compressed into one incident, most incorrectly regarded as an "infringement of the rights of the Imperial Government."

No. 24.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received July 31.)

(No. 501.)

My Lord,

Therapia, July 24, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 326 of the 12th May, relative to the military operations in the Nejd and the peaceful occupation by the Turkish troops of Boreyda, Aneyza, and Kassim, I have the honour to inform your Lordship that I am in receipt of a despatch from His Majesty's Consul at Bussorah reporting that the Turkish troops in Kassim moved on the 25th May to Shehig, which appears to be situated some 30 miles south-west of Boreyda. Ten battalions, however, should still be at Kassim.

Mr. Crow further states that, from advices received at the head-quarters of the 6th Army Corps at Bagdad, these troops appear to be in great straits from want of money and supplies. The men are on half rations and unable to buy shrouds for their dead. Instructions were sent to the Vilayet of Bussorah to remit money to Kassim, but so far only 1,500 liras have been forwarded.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

No. 25.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received July 31.)

(No. 502.)

My Lord,

Therapia, July 25, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith to your Lordship copy of a despatch which I have received from the Government of India, inclosing copy of a letter from Captain M. O'C. Tandy, R.E., formerly employed as British survey officer with the Aden Boundary Commission, calling attention to certain discrepancies between the descriptions and the maps signed by the British and Turkish Commissioners in connection with the recent local settlement of the Aden boundary.

I venture to suggest that the despatch of the Indian Government and its inclosure should be referred to Mr. Fitzmaurice, who is now in England on leave of absence, as he is the most competent person to deal with the points raised by Captain Tandy.

In order to save time it will be well that Mr. Fitzmaurice's observations should be communicated direct to the India Office.

I need, however, hardly point out to your Lordship that it will be very difficult at the present moment to make any alterations or modifications in the *procès-verbaux* signed by the British and Turkish Commissioners, and, further, that such a course must necessarily delay the exchange of maps, &c., of the boundary question.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

Inclosure 1 in No. 25.

Government of India to Sir N. O'Connor.

Sir,

Simla, June 29, 1905.

WITH reference to the documents and maps recently forwarded by Mr. Fitzmaurice to your Excellency direct, in connection with the recent local settlement of the Aden boundary, I am directed to forward herewith, for your Excellency's consideration, a copy of a letter from Captain M. O'C. Tandy, R.E., formerly British survey officer with the Aden Boundary Commission, in which he draws attention to discrepancies between the descriptions and the maps signed by the British and Turkish Commissioners. Captain Tandy's references are to the text of an English description signed by Mr. Fitzmaurice alone. The substance of his remarks, however, applies equally to the jointly signed document in French.

2. Your Excellency will, no doubt, after consultation with Mr. Fitzmaurice, consider whether the points raised under (b) and (c) in regard to Jebel Sin Sanfa and Jebel Kuwah are of sufficient importance to make it advisable to attempt a revision of the jointly signed description of the kind suggested by Captain Tandy.

3. No action is being taken on Captain Tandy's suggestion for the insertion of Barh-al-Mujariba in the final map, which will be exactly as signed by the Boundary Commissioners.

I have, &c.
(Signed) S. M. FRASER.

Inclosure 2 in No. 25.

Captain Tandy to Mr. C. Somers Cocks.

My dear Somers Cocks,

Benmore, Simla, June 17, 1905.

I RETURN herewith the description of the Aden boundary-line from Barh-am-Ashara to the sea, which you sent me with your demi-official letter of the 13th instant.

1. With regard to this part of the boundary, there are three points to which I should like to call your attention, viz.:—

(a.) The description of the boundary states:

"From J. Numau the line turns . . . passing through the points . . . Bahr-al-Haima . . ."

The name of this col should be Barh-al-Mujariba. While the survey was taking place, both Colonel Wahab and Mr. Fitzmaurice decided that this was a suitable spot for the boundary to traverse, and its correct name was therefore carefully ascertained. Mr. Fitzmaurice has, I fancy, forgotten the correct name, and to identify the point has called it after the nearest village. Which name shall I put on the final maps?

(b.) In the same paragraph of the description the line is said "to pass through J. Sin Sanfa," whereas on the map the red line stops nearly a mile short of this hill, and then passes about a mile and a-half to the east of it. This hill, which is visible from the sea, and which forms a very noticeable feature in the country, culminates (as its name implies) in a lofty, isolated, and sharply-pointed pinnacle, so that the name does not refer to the range but only to the point marked with a triangle on the map. In this case the intention of the Commissioners was undoubtedly that the boundary should run as shown on the map, and, in order that the description should agree with the map, either the words "J. Sin Sanfa" should be omitted, or the description might be amended somehow as follows:—

"From J. Numau the line turns . . . passing through the points . . . Nijdam-Rahaz (54); to the hill about 1 kilom. north of J. Sin Sanfa, and thence by Barh-Mashari to the summit of J. Jariba."

(c.) The description under heading LXVIII states:—

"It (the boundary) then descends . . . in a straight line to the top of J. Kuwah."

Now on J. Kuwah there are two points of almost equal height. From the western and slightly lower of these two points I made some observations, and at this point I built a small rubble cairn. This point is shown on the map by a triangle, and to this point the boundary-line has been drawn by the Commissioners. It is not, however, the true top of the hill, and any one trying to fix the boundary on the ground from the description would undoubtedly go to the highest (i.e., the eastern) point. The difference in height between the two points is about 4 or 5 feet, and they are about 150 yards apart, a distance which can be clearly shown on the large scale on which Sheikh Saïd has been surveyed. It is impossible to say what were the intentions of the Commissioners if they meant the boundary to run, as shown on the map, to the small cairn which I built. The description should be altered, "the western summit of J. Kuwah" being substituted for "the top of J. Kuwah"; but if they wished the boundary to run to the highest point of J. Kuwah, the line as drawn in red by the Commissioners should be altered.

2. The above may seem small points to you, but I feel it is my duty to bring them to your notice, and hope you will be able to give me instructions about them at an early date, as until you do so I shall be unable to send the maps to press.

Yours sincerely,
(Signed) M. O'C. TANDY.

No. 26.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received July 31.)

(No. 513.)
My Lord,

Therapia, July 26, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to report that I have to-day received a telegram from His Majesty's Vice-Consul at Hodeida reporting that during the past weeks the Turkish troops have been advancing simultaneously from Menakha and Taiz on Sana'a. They are said to have had two skirmishes with the insurgents in the neighbourhood of Menakha, in which the latter suffered severe losses.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

No. 27.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received July 31.)

(No. 514.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, July 26, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 477 of the 12th instant, I have the honour to forward to your Lordship herewith copy of a despatch from the Military Attaché to His Majesty's Embassy, reporting the progress made in the dispatch of reinforcements to the Yemen.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

Inclosure in No. 27.

Lieutenant-Colonel Maunsell to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 46.)

Sir,

Therapia, July 24, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to report as follows on the progress of reinforcements for the Yemen:—

After many orders and counter-orders, eight battalions of the 25th (Kharput) Redif Brigade are now on the march down to Alexandretta, and the first battalion of the brigade has arrived there, while others are shortly expected. They will be embarked on steamers of the Mahsusse Company, and transported to Hodeidah.

The 32nd (Tokat) Redif Brigade has been mobilized, and is now marching on Angora, where they will entrain for Smyrna by Afium Karahissar.

Two French steamers have been chartered to proceed to Smyrna for the conveyance of these men to Hodeidah.

Altogether, these will comprise a reinforcement of sixteen battalions, or about 12,000 men.

The 19th (Nizam Division), at one time under orders for the Yemen, has now, after several days of fruitless marching and counter-marching, returned to their original stations to await further orders, if required on the Russian frontier.

The 63rd (Karapapak) Hamidie Cavalry Regiment from Sivas, and the four regiments from Diabekir, under Ibrahim Pasha, which were under orders to go to the Yemen, have now been definitely countermanded, apparently as it was found hopeless to induce the Chiefs or their men to march.

This was specially true in the case of Ibrahim Pasha of Veraushehr. Notwithstanding this, however, four* Hamidie Regiments of the Haideranli tribe, north of Lake Van, under the command of the celebrated Hussein Pasha, have been ordered to mobilize and proceed to the Yemen. As they are close to the Russian frontier, these regiments might be employed along their immediate front in suppressing Armenian disturbances, and I have heard this was the intention; but the Minister of War assures me they are destined for the Yemen.

Consular despatches for some years past contain so much about Hussein Pasha of Patnotz and his doings that it is almost superfluous to add anything regarding the character of this brigand chieftain, as he may well be described.

From personal knowledge, I should scarcely think it likely he will ever go to the Yemen, although it might be for his country's good if he did.

In the Yemen itself, Ahmed Feizi Pasha is slowly feeling his way towards Sanaa, and has lately been engaged in some minor expeditions on either side of the main route, which have met with some measure of success.

He has now arrived at Mefhak, and possibly he may be able to push on to Sanaa itself, as the rebels do not seem inclined to oppose him in the open field.

But if he should enter the capital, they will probably pursue their former tactics, cut off his communications, and again starve the garrison into surrender.

In Assir certain minor Turkish successes have been gained, but Ebha, the capital, still remains in the hands of the rebels.

I have, &c.
(Signed) F. R. MAUNSELL, *Military Attaché.*

* 4th (Hamidie) Cavalry Brigade, Regiments Nos. 22, 23, 24, 25.

No. 28.

Mr. Graham to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received July 31.)

(No. 4.)

My Lord,

The Hague, July 29, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 3 of this day's date, I have the honour to report that I have this morning handed to the Secretary-General of the International Bureau twelve copies of the reply of His Majesty's Government to the Supplementary Conclusions of the French Government in the matter of the Muscat Dhows Arbitration.

I have received an acknowledgment of the receipt of these papers from M. de Ruysenaers, who informs me that he has distributed copies to the Arbitrators and to the French Agent, and that he is reserving one copy for the Bureau.

I have, &c.
(Signed) RONALD GRAHAM.

No. 29.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received July 31.)

(No. 108.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, July 31, 1905.

GRAND Shereef of Mecca.

Following sent to Cairo to-day:—

“(Confidential.)”

“I learn on fairly good authority that the succession to the Grand Shereefite has been declined by Abdillah, and that the choice now rests between the son or the nephew Ali of the late Shereef, now in Mecca, and Hussein and Sadyk, who are now here.”

No. 30.

Foreign Office to Mr. R. Graham.

(No. 1.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, July 31, 1905.

I AM directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to acknowledge the receipt of your despatches Nos. 1 and 2 of the 24th and 25th instant, forwarding copies of the “Conclusions Supplémentaires” which have been presented to the Arbitration Tribunal by the French Government, and reporting the decision of the Arbitrators to accept the document.

Your proceedings in regard to this matter, and the terms of the Declaration which you made to the Tribunal, are approved by His Majesty's Government.

I am, &c.
(Signed) E. GORST.

No. 31.

Mr. Graham to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received August 2.)

(No. 5.)

My Lord,

The Hague, August 1, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to report that the second sitting of the Muscat Arbitration Tribunal was held this morning at 10 o'clock.

The Secretary-General opened the proceedings by reading aloud my letter of the 29th ultimo, forwarding the reply of His Majesty's Government to the French Supplementary Conclusions, and a letter from the French Agent, requesting leave to attach to his delegation M. Eugène Balléro, Attaché to the French Legation here, a request to which the Court had acceded.

The President thanked me for the expedition with which His Majesty's Government had prepared and delivered their reply. The manner in which they had met the wishes of the Court in this respect, and had thus facilitated its labours, had been much appreciated.

27

The French Agent rose and stated that the French Government had, in principle, no observations to offer on the British reply, but that there were certain points of a general nature raised therein to which he desired to draw the attention of the Court, and that, unless an opportunity of doing so occurred during the course of the proceedings, he must request leave to make a brief statement.

The President replied that the Arbitrators were perfectly satisfied with the written Cases, which had been drawn up in a thorough and masterly manner. They did not desire to put any questions or to hear any oral arguments.

Permission was then granted to M. Herbette to deliver his Statement, copy of which is inclosed herewith. It attempts to deal *seriatim* with the points raised in the British reply, and was read out sheet by sheet, copies of each sheet being at the same time handed to the Arbitrators and to myself. I have numbered these sheets for convenience of reference.

During the delivery of No. 6, regarding the alleged grant by the British East Africa authorities to natives of Sur of licences to fly the Zanzibar flag, the President intervened, and said that the Court was doubtful whether these documents had any bearing on the question at issue.

M. Herbette urged that they were relevant, as the natives to whom they were granted were Suris and subjects of the Sultan of Muscat. He was allowed to continue his Statement, judgment being reserved as to whether or not the licences might eventually be produced to the Court.

The Arbitrators appeared to listen with some impatience to the French Agent's Statement. At its conclusion the President inquired whether I had any observations to offer, in the evident desire that I should waive the right to answer. I did not, however, feel justified in doing so until we had had an opportunity of examining the French Statement more carefully, and I reserved the right to reply. M. Lammasch said that my reply must be delivered at or before the next meeting of the Court, which would be held at 10 A.M. the following morning. He was proceeding to adjourn the Court until then, when I rose and pointed out that no decision had yet been reached regarding the Zanzibar licences. If they were to be admitted and produced to the Court, time would no doubt be allowed for His Majesty's Government to clear up the matter, and to furnish an explanation which the local authorities concerned had been called upon to supply. The Arbitrators, after a brief conversation, intimated that they had decided not to admit the production of the documents in question, which were accordingly handed back to the French Agent. The Court then adjourned until to-morrow.

I have carefully examined, with Mr. Craies, the French Statement. Your Lordship will, I think, agree that it deals principally, if not entirely, with points which have been already thoroughly threshed out in the written Cases; it adds little, if anything, to the controversy, and affords no material for an effective reply. The suggestion in No. 4, that His Majesty's Government should produce the Secret Treaty with the Sultan of Muscat of the 20th March, 1891, does not appear to call for any special notice.

I have no opportunity of obtaining your Lordship's instructions before the Court meets to-morrow morning. I have therefore decided to inform the Arbitrators that, unless they consider that the French Statement renders further elucidation desirable—in which case we are perfectly ready to meet any of the points raised—we prefer to leave the matter to the appreciation of the Tribunal and to make no further reply. Copy of my proposed Statement is herewith annexed.

I am convinced that we are not sacrificing any advantage in thus waiving the right to have the last word in the controversy. It is evident that in so doing we are consulting the wishes of the Court. Moreover, there appears to be little object in prolonging the discussion by refuting statements which are not in themselves effective, and which afford no scope for new or effective arguments in reply.

In order to expedite matters, and to enable the Arbitrators to proceed at once to their final deliberations, I have informed them, through the Court, of our decision, and have communicated copies of my proposed Statement to them and to the French Agent to-night.

I have, &c.
(Signed) RONALD GRAHAM.

Inclosure 1 in No. 31.

Statement by M. Herbet.

LE Gouvernement de la République n'a, en principe, aucune observation à présenter contre la réplique du Gouvernement de Sa Majesté Britannique à ses Conclusions Complémentaires.

Il désire, toutefois, signaler à l'attention du Tribunal quelques points d'ordre général.

Au cas où ces points n'auraient pas été examinés au cours des débats, et où l'occasion ne m'aurait pas été ainsi offerte, tout naturellement, de les mettre en relief, je solliciterais, alors, de la bienveillance du Tribunal l'autorisation de le faire très brièvement.

(1.)

Forme de l'Argument (Conclusions) du Gouvernement de Sa Majesté Britannique.

Il est possible que l'Argument Britannique ait été présenté dans la forme usitée en Angleterre, mais il n'en est pas moins vrai que cette forme donnait au Gouvernement Anglais la faculté de répondre au Contre-Mémoire Français.

Cette faculté ne nous était pas accordée, puisque les Conclusions, dans la procédure Française, ne sont qu'un résumé juridique des faits de la cause considérés comme prouvés.

Les précédents invoqués par la Grande-Bretagne remontent, au surplus, à une époque où la Cour d'Arbitrage de La Haye n'existait pas; d'autres, au contraire, s'appliquent à des affaires qui n'ont pas été soumises à cette Cour.

Il serait très heureux que le Tribunal créât une jurisprudence à cet égard.

(2.)

Intervention du Sultan de Mascate dans le présent Arbitrage.

Le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté Britannique fait ressortir, une fois de plus, dans sa réplique (p. 2), qu'avant la conclusion du Compromis du 13 Octobre, 1904, il s'était mis d'accord avec le Sultan de Mascate pour la présentation des arguments ayant trait aux immunités Françaises dans l'Oman, et qu'en conséquence, sa Hautesse Seyyid Feysal n'a pas été entraînée, malgré elle, dans le litige actuel.

La France a indiqué dans son Contre-Mémoire (p. 6) que, dès le début des négociations relatives au présent arbitrage, en Mai 1903, elle a refusé d'admettre l'intervention du Sultan.

Le 25 Mai, 1903, en effet, M. Paul Cambon, Ambassadeur de la République à Londres, repoussait un projet d'entente au sujet de l'arbitrage, que lui proposait le Marquis de Lansdowne et qui tendait à mêler le Souverain de l'Oman à la question pendante entre la France et la Grande-Bretagne.

M. Paul Cambon faisait observer alors au Secrétaire d'État des Affaires Étrangères que le Gouvernement Français acceptait l'arbitrage sur l'interprétation de ses Conventions avec l'Angleterre, ou des Déclarations communes aux deux pays, mais qu'il n'entendait en aucune façon accepter les demandes d'arbitrage qu'il plairait au Sultan de Mascate de lui adresser.

Devant cette déclaration formelle, le Marquis de Lansdowne consentit à supprimer la mention concernant le Sultan de Mascate, et le texte des lettres échangées le jour même, 25 Mai (voir Contre-Mémoire Français, Annexe III, pp. 79-80), en fait foi.

Le Gouvernement de la République a donc lieu de s'étonner de la démarche effectuée le 29 Juillet suivant par le Vice-Roi des Indes auprès du Sultan de Mascate, démarche qui a été renouvelée au cours de l'année 1904 et le 19 Mars, 1905.

Les observations qu'il a présentées à ce sujet, tant dans son Contre-Mémoire (p. 6) que dans ses Conclusions Complémentaires (p. 7), gardent toute leur valeur, même après la réplique du Gouvernement de Sa Majesté Britannique.

(3.)

Notification du Sultan pour interdire à l'avenir l'Octroi des Pavillons Étrangers.

La partie adverse ne donne aucune indication sur la date à laquelle on a interrogé le Sultan au sujet de l'authenticité des deux versions qui se rapportent à l'Édit du 15 Juin, 1900, et sur les conditions dans lesquelles cette interrogation lui a été posée.

Le débat reste donc ouvert en ce qui touche le texte réel de l'Édit et sa portée. Quant à l'affirmation Anglaise que l'Édit du Sultan ne constitue pas la reconnaissance, pour le passé, de la validité des titres de navigations étrangers, elle est contestée par la France, et les motifs de cette contestation sont exposés dans le Contre-Mémoire Français (p. 10) et dans les Conclusions Complémentaires (pp. 12 et 13).

Les Souris, contraints à remettre au Sultan leurs papiers Français, ont immédiatement protesté auprès du Consul de France à Mascate (Mémoire Français, pp. 65-70), et de nouveaux titres leur ont été alors délivrés.

Ils avaient en effet le droit de se réclamer de la protection Française, et de considérer comme nulle une renonciation à cette protection qui leur avait été imposée par la menace ou la violence.

(4.)

Les Protestations du Sultan.

Le Gouvernement Britannique est revenu, à différentes reprises, dans ses documents (Mémoire, p. 12, Appendice 10; Appendice 7, Annexe 9, Appendice 11, Contre-Mémoire, p. 8)—

“Sur le fait que le Sultan a commencé, dès Mars-Avril 1891, à protester contre l'octroi de titres et de pavillons Français à des Souris.”

Il y a peut-être lieu de rapprocher cette attitude de sa Hautesse Seyyid Feysal, de la signature des Traités Anglo-Mascatais des 19 Mars* et 20 Mars, 1891.

La France n'a eu connaissance que du texte du Traité du 19 Mars. Le Traité du 20 Mars ne lui a pas été communiqué pas plus qu'au Tribunal. C'est ainsi qu'elle est amenée à se demander s'il n'y a pas corrélation étroite entre les engagements contractés par le Sultan vis-à-vis de l'Angleterre, le 20 Mars, 1891, et la nouvelle politique qu'il a adoptée, à cette époque, à l'égard des boudes français.

Il serait très facile de dissiper cette équivoque en apportant le texte du Traité du 20 Mars, 1891.

(5.)

Droits de Police et de Juridiction dans les Eaux Territoriales.—Capitulations et Extraterritorialité.

Sur ces deux points, le Tribunal se trouve en présence de thèses différentes, qui ont été soutenues et défendues avec un soin égal par les deux Parties en cause; il lui appartient de les apprécier.

On doit remarquer, cependant, que dans tous les pays de Capitulation, c'est une règle constante de se référer aux coutumes et usages pour l'application des Traités ou en l'absence de Traités. On ne saurait, d'autre part, établir une distinction entre protégés, du fait de leur religion, car l'Article IV du Traité Franco-Mascatais du 17 Novembre, 1844, et l'Article II du Traité Anglo-Mascatais du 19 Mars, 1891, seraient alors difficilement applicables.

* Le Mémoire Britannique (p. 7) parle du Traité du 19 Août, 1891, et l'Appendice No. 3 (p. 35), qui publie le texte de cet Accord, indique la date, d'ailleurs exacte, du 19 Mars, 1891.

Francisation de Navires Indigènes par les Autorités Britanniques.

Contrairement à l'opinion émise à ce sujet dans la réplique du Gouvernement de Sa Majesté Britannique (p. 7), le Gouvernement de la République estime qu'il n'est nullement hors du débat actuel de noter la délivrance effectuée, le 5 Mai dernier, par les autorités de Lamou, de titres de navigation à deux indigènes indiqués comme résidant à Sour.

En offrant au Tribunal de lui présenter les originaux de ces pièces, la France n'a eu aucune arrière-pensée.

Les titres de navigation dont il s'agit, remis à Sour, le 19 Juin, au Gérant du Consulat de France, ne sont parvenus à Paris qu'après le dépôt des Conclusions Françaises. Il ne pouvait donc en être fait état avant la réunion du Tribunal, et aucune négociation directe ne pouvait non plus être engagée, à ce sujet, avec le Gouvernement Britannique, par un sentiment tout naturel de déférence à l'égard du Tribunal saisi de la question des bontres en général.

Au surplus, le Gouvernement de la République n'a élevé aucune protestation dans ses Conclusions Complémentaires contre le principe de la délivrance de titres de navigation à des embarcations indigènes par des autorités Britanniques.

Il a tenu seulement à signaler le fait aux Arbitres et à marquer sa surprise que deux Arabes, dont l'un a été reconnu comme protégé Français par la Grande-Bretagne elle-même, et l'autre est porté, avec le No. 1, sur la liste publiée dans son Contre-Mémoire (p. 297), aient vu changer leur pavillon par l'Agent Britannique à Lamou.

L'initiative de cet Agent ne peut, d'ailleurs, s'expliquer par le fait que les titres délivrés ne devaient servir à leurs détenteurs qu'à regagner Sour, puisque les nommés Mohammed-ben-Abdallah-ben-Sultan et Mohammed-ben-Selim sont déjà régulièrement en possession de papiers Français.

Redevance Zanzibarite.

Le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté Britannique ne conteste pas, dans sa réplique (p. 12), la valeur de la Sentence Arbitrale de Lord Canning en 1861. Il se borne à déclarer que l'obligation incombant à la Grande-Bretagne de payer la redevance Zanzibarite "ne dépend pas, sauf pour le montant, de la Sentence Arbitrale de 1861, mais bien des termes d'après lesquels le Gouvernement Britannique a assumé la charge de payer cette redevance au Sultan de Mascate, lorsqu'en 1873 le Sultan de Zanzibar a refusé de lui en continuer le paiement."

On est en droit de se demander pourquoi la Grande-Bretagne, qui admet une partie de la Sentence de Lord Canning, ne l'accepte pas intégralement aujourd'hui et ne voit plus, en elle, l'origine indiscutable de l'obligation de payer au Sultan de Mascate la redevance Zanzibarite.

En 1885 l'opinion du Gouvernement Britannique était différente, et il ne songait nullement à se retrancher derrière les termes de l'Accord de 1873.

Dans un Mémoire adressé le 17 Octobre, 1885, au Lieutenant-Colonel Kitchener par Lord Salisbury, et publié dans le Livre Bleu relatif aux affaires de Zanzibar ("Africa No. 1," Janvier, 1886, pp. 74 et 75), il est déclaré en effet :

"Ainsi les deux héritages d'Oman furent séparés et la Sentence Arbitrale dit que la redevance payable par le Souverain de Zanzibar à celui de Mascate doit être considérée comme une compensation au Souverain de Mascate pour l'abandon de ses prétentions aux territoires d'Afrique, ayant appartenu au défunt Sultan, dans le but de compenser l'inégalité entre les deux héritages.

"Il est vrai que plus tard le Gouvernement Britannique prit à sa charge le paiement de la redevance au Souverain de Mascate, mais il fit cela, d'abord par considération pour le Sultan de Mascate, auquel le Sultan de Zanzibar refusait de faire un paiement quelconque, et ensuite parce que, du point de vue des intérêts de la Grande-Bretagne et de l'Inde Anglaise, on attachait de l'importance à ce que la paix fût maintenue conformément aux termes de la Sentence rendue par Lord Canning."

Il résulte de ce Mémoire officiel, publié dans un document Parlementaire

Britannique, tenu à la disposition du Tribunal, qu'en 1885 le Marquis de Salisbury n'invoquait nullement l'ouvrage classique sur Mascate, "les Traités d'Aitchison," et que l'explication qu'il donnait de la prise en charge par la Grande-Bretagne de la redevance Zanzibarite diffère essentiellement de celle qui est apportée aujourd'hui au Tribunal.

Il convient de noter également que l'établissement du Protectorat Anglais à Zanzibar confirme la théorie Française.

La "narrative" relative à Mascate dans l'"Aitchison's Treaties" affirme que, "tout en garantissant le paiement de la redevance de 40,000 couronnes au Sultan de Mascate, le Gouvernement Britannique n'a pas formellement relevé le Sultan de Zanzibar de l'obligation qui lui a été imposée par l'arbitrage."

En conséquence, d'après cet ouvrage classique lui-même, l'obligation théorique du Sultan de Zanzibar existait encore en 1890. Le Protectorat a eu pour résultat la substitution pure et simple de la Grande-Bretagne au Sultan de Zanzibar en ce qui touche les obligations de ce Prince. Donc le paiement de la redevance Zanzibarite au Sultan de Mascate ne dépend pas exclusivement de l'Accord de 1873.

Enfin, dans la préoccupation manifestée par le Gouvernement Britannique de prouver son droit de priver sa Haute-Seigneurie Seyyid Feysal de la majeure partie de ses ressources, peut-on voir autre chose que le désir de conserver intact un moyen de pression sur le Souverain indépendant de l'Oman, ce qui est incompatible avec l'engagement réciproque du 10 Mars, 1862 ?

Inclosure 2 in No. 31.

Proposed Reply of Mr. Graham.

I DESIRE to thank the Tribunal for the opportunity afforded to me of examining the Statement delivered by the French Agent yesterday.

The questions discussed in this Statement appear to have been fully dealt with in the written Cases. Should the Tribunal be of opinion that further elucidation is rendered desirable, and intimate this desire, we are perfectly ready to meet any of the points raised. Failing this, however, we do not consider it necessary to delay the proceedings by entering a reply. We prefer to leave the matter, with full confidence, to the appreciation of the Tribunal, and to make no further statement.

No. 32.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received August 2.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of inclosure in a letter from the Foreign Secretary to the Government of India, dated the 13th July, relative to the issue of French flags to Suri dhow owners.

India Office, August 2, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 32.

Major Grey to Government of India.

Sir,

Muscat, June 19, 1905.

WITH reference to paragraph 3 of my letter dated the 3rd April last, I have the honour to report having heard from Sur that the French Vice-Consul has collected all the old French flags from their holders and given out new ones in exchange. He has not, so far as I am informed, issued any flags to persons who were not already in possession of old ones.

A copy of this letter has been forwarded to the Political Resident in the Persian Gulf, Bushire.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. G. GREY.

No. 33.

Mr. R. Graham to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received August 3.)

(No. 6. Confidential.)

My Lord,

The Hague, August 2, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 5 of yesterday, I have the honour to report that the Muscat Arbitration Tribunal met at 10.30 this morning.

The Secretary-General opened the proceedings by reading aloud a letter which I had addressed to the Court yesterday afternoon to the effect that it was not our intention to reply to the last statement made by the French Agent, unless the Court expressed a wish for further elucidations.

My statement in the above sense, copy of which was inclosed in my despatch No. 5 of yesterday, was then delivered to the Tribunal.

The President, after consulting his colleagues, stated that no further elucidation of the question was necessary, and declared the Court adjourned until the final sittings. He was unable to state definitely when that would be, but promised that forty-eight hours' notice should be given. I gather that the Court will probably meet to deliver judgment on Monday, the 7th, or at the latest on Tuesday, the 8th instant.

As your Lordship is aware, from my immediately preceding despatch, the Tribunal had rejected as irrelevant to the question at issue the two papers granted by the British East Africa authorities to natives of Sur, entitling them to use the Zanzibar flag, which the French Agent endeavoured to produce to the Court. There was therefore no occasion for me to read to the Court the telegram from the Commissioner of the East Africa Protectorate, as suggested in your Lordship's telegram No. 2 of last night. I have, however, communicated a paraphrase of it to the French Agent for his information, and I will see that this simple explanation of the grant of these papers is brought privately to the knowledge of the Arbitrators.

I have, &c.
(Signed) RONALD GRAHAM.

No. 34.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received August 3.)

Sir,

India Office, August 2, 1905.

WITH reference to my letter of the 7th January last and to Mr. Townley's despatch No. 90 of the 7th February last, I am directed by Mr. Secretary Brodrick to inclose, for the information of the Marquess of Lansdowne, a copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, reporting that the notorious pirate, Ahmed-bin-Selman, has again been committing piracies in the Persian Gulf.

I am, &c.
(Signed) A. GODLEY.

Inclosure in No. 34.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.) P.

July 22, 1905.

PIRACIES off Bahrein. Please see Government of India letter, dated the 8th December, 1904, No. 231. Political Resident in Persian Gulf telegraphs, under date of the 15th instant, as follows:—

"Please see my diary for last week, item No. 14. The pirate Ahmed-bin-Selman is again abroad, and has committed two piracies. I am in communication with Senior Naval Officer on the subject. It seems to me that in present circumstances the impotence and apathy of the Turkish Government might serve as a useful instrument in pressing other matters upon them."

Statement in diary referred to was to the effect that Bahrein pearl merchant's boat was attacked, and lost two men killed and two wounded, on the 26th June, about two hours' sail from Manama.

No. 35.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received August 3.)

Sir,

India Office, August 2, 1905.

WITH reference to your letter of the 10th July on the subject of the Aden Protectorate boundary, I am directed by Mr. Secretary Brodrick to inclose, for the information of the Marquess of Lansdowne, copy of telegrams which have passed between this Office and the Government of India on the subject.

Mr. Brodrick concurs with the Government of India in thinking that it is necessary to take steps to prevent the total disappearance, which is apprehended, of the pillars, and he would suggest that His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople should be consulted on the question whether the difficulties anticipated by Mr. Fitzmaurice might not be obviated by a formal notification to the Turkish authorities, as proposed by the Government of India, concerning the steps which it is intended to take to maintain the pillars in repair.

If Lord Lansdowne agrees in this proposal, Mr. Brodrick would also suggest that Sir N. O'Connor should be consulted as to the manner in which the notification should be made. It was proposed in paragraph 4 (1) of my letter of the 4th February last that, pending arrangements of a permanent character, all communications between authorities on either side of the border in regard to disputes in that part of the frontier should be made through the channel of the Political Officer at Dthala.

I am, &c.
(Signed) A. GODLEY.

Inclosure 1 in No. 35.

Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

India Office, July 19, 1905.

ADEN boundary.

Your despatch No. 253 of 1904.

From your letter of the 30th April to Government of Bombay, I gather that erection of additional pillars is no longer recommended by you. As regards alternative proposal for improving existing pillars, this, in opinion of Fitzmaurice, whom the Foreign Office have consulted, will cause trouble with the Turks, as they will accuse Ameer of tampering with boundary as settled. I am inclined, under the circumstances, not to take any action on the letter of the 15th November last from Merewether. Please let me know whether you concur in this course.

Inclosure 2 in No. 35.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.) P.

July 23, 1905.

ADEN boundary.

Your telegram of the 19th instant.

We remain of opinion that, as recommended in our despatch of the 29th December, best course will be to erect additional pillars if and when it is found feasible to do so. In the meantime, measures detailed in our letter to the Government of Bombay of the 30th April are in our opinion necessary to preserve existing pillars from actually disappearing altogether, rather than with a view to improving them. Therefore we adhere to our view, and would insist on annual repair of pillars being made the duty of Ameer of Dthala, in order to prevent loss of benefits of demarcation; though, with a view to obviating accusations which Mr. Fitzmaurice anticipates will be brought against us, it may be provided that the Turkish authorities must first be given formal notice.

33

No. 35.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received August 3.)

Sir,

India Office, August 2, 1905.

WITH reference to the letter from this Office of the 24th May last, inclosing copy of a despatch to the Government of India as to the flagstaffs on the Maklab Isthmus and Sheep and Telegraph Islands, I am directed to forward the copy of a telegram from the Viceroy on the subject, and the draft of a reply which Mr. Secretary Brodrick proposes, with the concurrence of the Marquess of Lansdowne, to send thereto.

I am, &c.
(Signed) A. GODLEY.

Inclosure 1 in No. 35.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.) P.

July 22, 1905.

FLAGSTAFFS on Musandim.

We propose, with reference to your Secret despatch of the 19th May last, that, pending the declaration of Award of Hague Tribunal, actual removal of flagstaffs on Sheep Island and isthmus should be deferred. Their removal now, or their consignment to the care of the Sultan, might result in drawing the attention of the Tribunal to action we have already taken, whereas hitherto the presence of the staffs has not been noticed either by the French or by the Sultan. As regards Telegraph Island, retention of flagstaff there may be attended with some advantage as showing that assertion of sovereignty of Sultan of Muscat subsequent to our original occupation does not affect our right to reoccupy. But discussion of this subject with the Sultan might, in our opinion, be deferred until Arbitration Award has been delivered. The possible revival of British claim to Telegraph Island would resemble revival of our claim to Henjam Station, and does not, in our view, present any parallel with the Bunder Gisseh incident.

Inclosure 2 in No. 35.

Draft Telegram from Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

(Secret.)

India Office, August , 1905.

YOURS 22nd July. Musandim flagstaffs.

I have no objection to course proposed in regard to flagstaffs on isthmus and Sheep Island. Question of Telegraph Island will require further consideration before any communication is made to Sultan on the subject.

No. 36.

Memorandum by Mr. Fitzmaurice on Captain M. O'C. Tandy's letter of June 17, 1905, to Mr. C. Somers Cocks.

[Inclosure in the Secretary to the Government of India's letter to Sir N. R. O'Connor, dated June 29, 1905.]

AS regards the first point (a) mentioned by Captain Tandy, my distinct recollection is that, when I visited the col in question with Sheikh Rabbash (Head Sheikh of the Haiki sub-tribe) and his followers, they gave the name of the spot as Barh-al-Haima, a version which tallied with that given independently to one of the Turkish Commissioners; that Captain Tandy's native surveyor brought in a different name for the place; and that I again visited the col with the Turkish Chief Commissioner, Colonel Mustapha Remzi Bey, accompanied by natives who again gave the name as Barh-al-Haima. The Joint Commission, accordingly, accepted

[1569]

K

that version as correct, and it was inserted in the description of the boundary. There seems, then, no ground for altering it.

2. As regards (b), I think the description of the line as "following the watershed" and "passing through Jebel Sin Sanfa" is not incorrect. My inquiries on the spot were to the effect that the lofty sharply-pointed pinnacle, mentioned by Captain Tandy, was called simply Sin Sanfa, or "Tooth of Sanfa" (from its resemblance to a tooth), while the hill, of which it was the most prominent feature, was known to the natives as Jebel Sanfa, or Jebel Sin Sanfa.

The description obviously refers to a line passing along the waterparting of Jebel Sin Sanfa, and is not, I think, open to misconception.

3. As regards the third point (c), the description makes the boundary proceed "in a straight line to the top of J. Kuwah," and not to the highest point of J. Kuwah, as it was at first intended to describe it. On visiting the locality in last April, I noticed that the cairn erected by Captain Tandy did not seem to be quite the highest point, and it was therefore decided to take the line to the point triangulated by Captain Tandy and to make it thence follow "the heights" to LXX. As both points, between which there is a difference in height of only 4 or 5 feet, are, so to speak, on the top of J. Kuwah, it would appear that, if the map with the line on it be compared with the ground, there can be no misunderstanding as to where the boundary runs, and consequently no necessity for altering the description. There would then seem to be no reason for delaying sending the maps to press.

(Signed) G. H. FITZMAURICE.

London, August 3, 1905.

No. 37.

Sir A. Hardinge to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received August 5.)

(No. 139. Confidential.)

My Lord,

Gulahek, June 21, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to report, with reference to previous correspondence closing with your Lordship's despatch No. 78 of the 13th ultimo, that I to-day asked the Mushir-ed-Dowleh if the Persian Government had arrived at any decision respecting the status of Koweit Arabs in Persia.

His Excellency replied that the result of his inquiries at Constantinople had been to establish the fact that the Sublime Porte regarded all Koweitis as Ottoman subjects, and would strongly object to their being protected in Persia by any other Power. What ought he under these circumstances to do, bearing in mind that the Persian Government did not want to have a quarrel on the subject with Turkey?

I said that I fully agreed with his Excellency that good relations between the two neighbouring Mahomedan Empires were most desirable, but, on the other hand, if Koweitis were oppressed by the Persian Customs authorities, it was natural that the Sheikh of Koweit should, in virtue of his special arrangements with us, apply to us for redress, and I thought, in the interest of Persian pilgrims and traders in the Arab regions more or less affected by his influence, that he should not, by applying to us in vain, be tempted to resort to reprisals. It was for the Persian Government to decide whether he was, *de facto*, sufficiently independent of Turkey to do this if provoked, and to be guided in its policy accordingly. I again repeated that we had no desire to embarrass Persian relations with the Porte by any ostentatious protection of Koweitis in this country, but only wished, in fulfilment of our obligations to Sheikh Mubarak, to afford to them such effectual if officious assistance as we from time to time extended to Afghans.

The Mushir-ed-Dowleh said that he would write to the Shah and report what I had said, unless I preferred to let the matter stand over until His Majesty's return to Persia, and that in the meantime he would direct the Customs and other Persian officials in the Gulf to avoid giving occasion to awkward questions by treating Koweitis with harshness. I replied that, whilst unwilling to press his Excellency too hard on a matter which I admitted to be delicate, I thought it would be well that he should again communicate my suggestions to the Shah without waiting for His Majesty's return. I added that the orders which he had suggested giving the Persian Customs and other officers on the Gulf appeared to me to be very judicious, and likely, if loyally carried out, to assist in tiding over the present difficulty.

It is not probable that any definite decision will be taken till the Shah's return on a question as to which the Persian Government is clearly anxious to procrastinate, but the knowledge that we may again raise it in a form likely to embarrass them may make the Persian authorities more careful in their treatment of Koweit dhows and subjects.

I have, &c.

(Signed) ARTHUR H. HARDINGE.

No. 38.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received August 5.)

Sir,

India Office, August 5, 1905.

WITH reference to Sir H. Walpole's letter of the 17th December, 1904, and to subsequent correspondence on the subject of the traffic in arms in the Red Sea, I am directed by Mr. Secretary Brodrick to inclose a copy of a telegram from the Viceroy, dated the 2nd instant, inquiring whether there is any objection to the Resident at Aden visiting Berbera and Jibuti before making proposals for checking the traffic.

Mr. Brodrick will be glad to be favoured with Lord Lansdowne's views on the proposed visit to Jibuti.

I am, &c.

(Signed) A. GODLEY.

Inclosure in No. 38.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Telegraphic.)

Simla, August 2, 1905.

FOLLOWING from Bombay Government, the 27th ultimo:—

"Traffic in arms, Aden. Resident wishes to visit Berbera and Jibuti before making proposals. Governor of Jibuti expressed anxiety to Commander of 'Perseus' to co-operate, and desire for opportunity of consultation."

Is there any objection to proposed visit?

No. 39.

Mr. Graham to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received August 6.)

(No. 7.)

My Lord,

The Hague, August 5, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatches Nos. 5 and 6 of the 1st and 2nd instant, I have the honour to transmit to your Lordship herewith copies of the Protocols of the 2nd and 3rd Sitzings of the Muscat Arbitration Tribunal.*

The Protocols in question are very incomplete, and frequently inaccurate. The fact is that to follow the proceedings of the Court, which are conducted in French and English concurrently, and which often lead to somewhat desultory discussions, puts a severe strain on the capacities of the Secretaries, none of whom have any knowledge of the questions at issue, or belong to either of the nationalities represented on the Arbitration. The presence on such occasions of an official shorthand writer is to be desired.

As your Lordship is aware, the Tribunal at its first sitting decided that the French text of the Protocols was to be the official and only authentic version of the proceedings. At the outset the Secretary-General asked me whether it would be necessary to include in the English translation of the Protocols English versions of the formal statements made by the French Agent. I replied that it would not be necessary, provided that any similar statements made by me appeared in English in the French official text. This course has since been followed throughout, and has apparently been acquiesced in

* Not printed.

by the French Agent. It was obviously more important (and even a useful precedent to establish) that statements made by the British Agent should appear in the official version of the proceedings in the language in which they were delivered, than that we should be supplied with a doubtful and, in any case, valueless English translation of the French Agent's statements.

I have, &c.
(Signed) RONALD GRAHAM.

No. 40.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received August 7.)

(No. 521.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, July 31, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 398 of the 11th ultimo, I have the honour to forward to your Lordship herewith copy of a despatch from His Majesty's Consul-General at Bagdad on the subject of the disturbances near Tawarij, and reporting that the incident is closed.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

Inclosure in No. 40.

Consul-General Newmarch to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 474/45.)

Sir,

Bagdad, June 27, 1905.

IN continuation of my telegram of the 7th instant about disturbances near Tawarij, I have the honour to report, on the authority of the British Vice-Consul at Karbala, that peace has been restored on the following conditions:—

- (1) The Arabs to receive back all the property taken from them.
- (2) The Turkish officer responsible for the attack on the Arabs to be dismissed.
- (3) A reduction of the amount claimed from the Arabs as taxes.
- (4) The prosecution at law of the officer responsible for the deaths and disgrace of the Arabs.

2. The incident is said to be at an end.

I have, &c.
(Signed) L. S. NEWMARCH, Major.

No. 41.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received August 7.)

(No. 525.)

My Lord,

Therapia, August 1, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 513 of the 26th ultimo, respecting the revolt in the Yemen, I have the honour to report that the "Official Gazette," in its issue of to-day, announces that Marshal Feizi Pasha, the General Officer Commanding the troops in the Yemen, has also been appointed Acting Vali of the province.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

No. 42.

Mr. Graham to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received August 7.)

(No. 8.)

My Lord,

The Hague, August 6, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 7 of the 5th instant, I have the honour to report that I have received a note from M. de Ruysenaers, informing me that the Muscat Arbitration Tribunal will meet on Tuesday next, the 8th instant, at 3 p.m. for the delivery of the Award.

I propose to return to London the same evening.

I have, &c.
(Signed) RONALD GRAHAM.

No. 43.

Admiralty to Foreign Office.—(Received August 8.)

(Confidential.)

Sir,

Admiralty, August 7, 1905.

WITH reference to your letter of the 29th ultimo, I am commanded by my Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty to transmit, for the information of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, copy of a telegram dated to-day from the Senior Naval Officer, Aden division.

I am, &c.
(Signed) EVAN MACGREGOR.

Inclosure in No. 43.

Senior Naval Officer, Aden, to Admiralty.

(Telegraphic.)

"Foz," at Aden, August 7, 1905.

"PERSEUS" arrived.

With reference to Admiralty telegram, "Perseus" reports there is nothing at Farsan Island or Kamaran about the Germans re-establishing a coaling station. Coal depôt, Khum Island, not changed. No German men-of-war visited Farsan Island for three years. About 100 tons German coal on the beach opposite coal depôt. Turkish authorities, Kamaran, wished buoys replaced. This was done. Buoys necessary for navigation.

No. 44.

Mr. Graham to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received August 9.)

(No. 9.)

My Lord,

The Hague, August 8, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to report that the Muscat Arbitration Tribunal met at 3 o'clock this afternoon and the Award, copy of which is herewith annexed, was read aloud by the Secretary-General in French and English.

As regards (a), the scope of the Declaration of the 10th March, 1862, in relation to the issue by France to certain subjects of the Sultan of Muscat of papers authorizing them to fly the French flag, the Award decides that:—

"1. Before the 2nd January, 1892, France was entitled to authorize vessels belonging to subjects of His Highness the Sultan of Muscat to fly the French flag, only bound by her own legislation and administrative rules."

The date in question is that of the ratification of the Brussels Act, the Court holding that France is, in relation to Great Britain, bound to grant her flag only under the conditions prescribed by Article 32 of that Act.

"2. Owners of dhows, who before 1892 have been authorized by France to fly the French flag, retain this authorization as long as France renews it to the grantee."

"3. After the 2nd January, 1892, France was not entitled to authorize vessels belonging to subjects of His Highness the Sultan of Muscat to fly the French flag, except on condition that their owners or fitters-out had established, or should establish,

that they had been considered and treated by France as her 'protégés' before the year 1863."

The year 1863 is taken as the date at which, in virtue of legislation by the Ottoman Porte, and of the Franco-Moroccan Treaty of that year, the creation of new "protégés" was regulated and limited.

As regards (b), the nature of the privileges and immunities claimed by subjects of the Sultan who are owners or masters of dhows and possess French papers, or are members of the crew of such dhows, and their families, especially as to the manner in which such privileges and immunities affect the jurisdiction of His Highness over his said subjects, the Award decides that:—

"1. Dhows of Muscat authorized as aforesaid to fly the French flag are entitled, in the territorial waters of Muscat, to the inviolability provided by the French-Muscat Treaty of the 17th November, 1844.

"2. The authorization to fly the French flag cannot be transmitted or transferred to any other person or to any other dhow, even if belonging to the same owner.

"3. Subjects of the Sultan of Muscat who are owners or masters of dhows authorized to fly the French flag, or who are members of the crews of such vessels, or who belong to their families, do not enjoy, in consequence of that fact, any right of extraterritoriality, which could exempt them from the sovereignty, especially from the jurisdiction, of His Highness the Sultan of Muscat."

The results of the Award may be summarized as follows:—

France may renew the licences to fly the French flag granted to owners of dhows before the 2nd January, 1892. But no licences given since that date are valid, unless the grantee was a *bond fide* French protégé before 1863. This decision will, it is believed, reduce the number of French flagholders to the number of ten or twelve at the utmost. Moreover, under Article 2 of (b), the licences in question cannot be transmitted or transferred to any other dhow, even if belonging to the same owner. Thus it would appear that if one of the licensed dhows were to be lost or disabled, the owner, in order to obtain a new licence, must prove that he comes under the category of those who were *bond fide* French protégés before 1863. Such protégés must now be scarce, and the number of French flagholders should, in the course of a few years, be reduced to vanishing point.

Under Article 1 of (b), dhows flying the French flag are declared to be inviolable in Muscat waters, and thus they are exempt from search. This decision is regrettable in view of the active participation of such dhows in the slave trade. But under Article 3 of (b), the owners, masters, and crews of the dhows, or their families, are expressly declared not to enjoy any such inviolability, and the moment they set foot in Muscat territory they come under the sovereignty and jurisdiction of the Sultan. The Tribunal has definitely laid down that the withdrawal of such persons from the Sultan's sovereignty and jurisdiction would be in contradiction with the Declaration of the 10th March, 1862. This important decision will no doubt afford much satisfaction to the Sultan, and determines, entirely in His Highness' favour, the controversy regarding the three French protected Suris who broke quarantine in April 1903, the incident which in reality gave rise to the present arbitration.

After the Secretary-General had finished reading the Award, the President made a brief speech, thanking the agents and secretaries for the manner in which they had assisted the Court, and then declared the proceedings at an end.

I have, &c.

(Signed) RONALD GRAHAM.

Inclosure in No. 44.

Official English Translation of Muscat Arbitration Award, delivered August 8, 1905.

Protocol IV.—Meeting of Tuesday, August 8, 1905.

THE Tribunal met at 3 p.m.

The President calls on the Secretary-General of the Tribunal to read the Award of the Tribunal, which is as follows:—

The Tribunal of Arbitration constituted in virtue of the "Compromis" concluded at London on the 13th October, 1904, between Great Britain and France;

Whereas the Government of His Britannic Majesty and that of the French

Republic have thought it right by the Declaration of the 10th March, 1862, "to engage reciprocally to respect the independence" of His Highness the Sultan of Muscat;

Whereas difficulties as to the scope of that Declaration have arisen in relation to the issue, by the French Republic, to certain subjects of His Highness the Sultan of Muscat of papers authorizing them to fly the French flag, and also as to the nature of the privileges and immunities claimed by subjects of His Highness who are owners or masters of dhows and in possession of such papers or are members of the crew of such dhows and their families, especially as to the manner in which such privileges and immunities affect the jurisdiction of His Highness the Sultan over his said subjects;

Whereas the two Governments have agreed by the "Compromis" of the 13th October, 1904, that these questions shall be determined by reference to arbitration, in accordance with the provisions of Article I of the Convention concluded between the two Powers on the 14th October, 1903;

Whereas in virtue of that "Compromis" were named as Arbitrators—

By the Government of His Britannic Majesty, Mr. Melville W. Fuller, Chief Justice of the United States of America;

And by the Government of the French Republic, Jonkheer A. F. de Savornin Lohman, Doctor of Law, former Minister of the Interior in the Netherlands, former Professor at the Free University at Amsterdam, Member of the Second Chamber of the States-General;

Whereas the two Arbitrators not having agreed within one month from the date of their appointment in the choice of an Umpire, and that choice having then been intrusted in virtue of Article I of the "Compromis" to the King of Italy, His Majesty has named Umpire:

Mr. H. Lammasch, Doctor of Law, Professor at the University at Vienna, Member of the Upper House of the Austrian Parliament;

Whereas the Cases, Counter-Cases, and Arguments have been duly communicated to the Tribunal and to the Parties;

Whereas the Tribunal has carefully examined these documents, and the supplementary observations which were delivered to it by the two Parties;

As to the first question:

Whereas generally speaking it belongs to every Sovereign to decide to whom he will accord the right to fly his flag and to prescribe the rules governing such grants, and whereas therefore the granting of the French flag to subjects of His Highness the Sultan of Muscat in itself constitutes no attack on the independence of the Sultan;

Whereas nevertheless a Sovereign may be limited by Treaties in the exercise of this right, and whereas the Tribunal is authorized in virtue of Article XLVIII of the Convention for the pacific settlement of international disputes of the 29th July, 1899, and of Article V of the "Compromis" of the 13th October, 1904, "to declare its competence in interpreting the 'Compromis' as well as the other Treaties which may be invoked in the Case, and in applying the principles of international law," and whereas therefore the question arises, under what conditions Powers which have acceded to the General Act of the Brussels Conference of the 2nd July, 1890, relative to the African slave trade, especially to Article XXXII of this Act, are entitled to authorize native vessels to fly their flags;

Whereas by Article XXXII of this Act the faculty of the Signatory Powers to grant their flag to native vessels has been limited for the purpose of suppressing slave trading and in the general interests of humanity, irrespective of whether the applicant for the flag may belong to a State signatory of this Act or not, and whereas at any rate France is in relation to Great Britain bound to grant her flag only under the conditions prescribed by this Act;

Whereas, in order to attain the above-mentioned purpose, the Signatory Powers of the Brussels Act have agreed in its Article XXXII that the authority to fly the flag of one of the Signatory Powers shall in future only be granted to such native vessels which shall satisfy all the three following conditions:—

1. Their fitters-out or owners must be either subjects of or persons protected by the Power whose flag they claim to fly;

2. They must furnish proof that they possess real estate situated in the district of the authority to whom their application is addressed, or supply a solvent security as a guarantee for any fines to which they may eventually become liable;

3. Such fitters-out or owners, as well as the captain of the vessel, must furnish proof that they enjoy a good reputation, and especially that they have never been condemned for acts of Slave Trade;

Whereas, in default of a definition of the term "protégé" in the General Act of the Brussels Conference this term must be understood in the sense which corresponds best as well to the elevated aims of the Conference and its Final Act as to the principles of the law of nations as they have been expressed in Treaties existing at that time in internationally recognized legislation and in international practice;

Whereas the aim of the said Article XXXII is to admit to navigation in the seas infested by Slave Trade only those native vessels which are under the strictest surveillance of the Signatory Powers, a condition which can only be secured if the owners, fitters-out, and crews of such vessels are exclusively subjected to the sovereignty and jurisdiction of the State under whose flag they are sailing;

Whereas since the restriction which the term "protégé" underwent in virtue of the legislation of the Ottoman Porte of 1863, 1865, and 1869, especially of the Ottoman Law of 23 Sefer, 1280 (August 1863), implicitly accepted by the Powers who enjoy the rights of capitulations, and since the Treaty concluded between France and Morocco in 1863, to which a great number of other Powers have acceded, and which received the sanction of the Convention of Madrid of the 30th July, 1880, the term "protégé" embraces in relation to States of capitulations only the following classes: (1) persons being subjects of a country which is under the protectorate of the Power whose protection they claim; (2) individuals corresponding to the classes enumerated in the Treaties with Morocco of 1863 and 1880 and in the Ottoman Law of 1863; (3) persons who, under a special Treaty, have been recognized as "protégés" like those enumerated by Article IV of the French-Muscat Convention of 1844; and (4) those individuals who can establish that they had been considered and treated as "protégés" by the Power in question before the year in which the creation of new "protégés" was regulated and limited, that is to say, before the year 1863, these individuals not having lost the status they had once legitimately acquired;

Whereas that, although the Powers have *expressis verbis* resigned the exercise of the pretended right to create "protégés" in unlimited number only in relation to Turkey and Morocco, nevertheless the exercise of this pretended right has been abandoned also in relation to other Oriental States, analogy having always been recognized as a mean to complete the very deficient written regulations of the capitulations as far as circumstances are analogous;

Whereas, on the other hand, the concession *de facto* made by Turkey that the status of "protégés" be transmitted to the descendants of persons who in 1863 had enjoyed the protection of a Christian Power, cannot be extended by analogy to Muscat, where the circumstances are entirely dissimilar, the "protégés" of the Christian Powers in Turkey being of race, nationality, and religion different from their Ottoman Rulers, whilst the inhabitants of Sur and other Muscat people who might apply for French flags are in all these respects entirely in the same condition as the other subjects of the Sultan of Muscat;

Whereas the dispositions of Article IV of the French-Muscat Treaty of 1844 apply only to persons who are *bond fide* in the service of French subjects, but not to persons who ask for ships' papers for the purpose of doing any commercial business;

Whereas the fact of having granted before the ratification of the Brussels Act on the 2nd January, 1892, authorizations to fly the French flag to native vessels not satisfying the conditions prescribed by Article XXXII of this Act was not in contradiction with any international obligation of France;

For these reasons, decides and pronounces as follows:—

1. Before the 2nd January, 1892, France was entitled to authorize vessels belonging to subjects of His Highness the Sultan of Muscat to fly the French flag, only bound by her own legislation and administrative rules;

2. Owners of dhows who before 1892 have been authorized by France to fly the French flag retain this authorization as long as France renews it to the grantee;

3. After the 2nd January, 1892, France was not entitled to authorize vessels belonging to subjects of His Highness the Sultan of Muscat to fly the French flag, except on condition that their owners or fitters-out had established, or should establish,

that they had been considered and treated by France as her "protégés" before the year 1863.

As to the second question:—

Whereas the legal situation of vessels flying foreign flags and of the owners of such vessels in the territorial waters of an Oriental State is determined by the general principles of jurisdiction, by the capitulations or other Treaties, and by the practice resulting therefrom;

Whereas the terms of the Treaty of Friendship and Commerce between France and the Iman of Muscat of the 17th November, 1844, are, particularly in view of the language of Article III, "Nul ne pourra, sous aucun prétexte, pénétrer dans les maisons, magasins et autres propriétés, possédés ou occupés par des Français ou par des personnes au service des Français, ni les visiter sans le consentement de l'occupant, à moins que ce ne soit avec l'intervention du Consul de France," comprehensive enough to embrace vessels as well as other property;

Whereas, although it cannot be denied that by admitting the right of France to grant under certain circumstances her flag to native vessels, and to have these vessels exempted from visitation by the authorities of the Sultan or in his name, slave trade is facilitated, because slave traders may easily abuse the French flag for the purpose of escaping from search, the possibility of this abuse, which can be entirely suppressed by the accession of all Powers to Article XLII of the Brussels Convention, cannot affect the decision of this case, which must only rest on juridical grounds;

Whereas according to the Articles XXXI—XLI of the Brussels Act, the grant of the flag to a native vessel is strictly limited to this vessel and its owner, and therefore not transmissible or transferable to any other person or to any other vessel, even if belonging to the same owner;

Whereas Article IV of the French-Muscat Treaty of 1844 grants to those subjects of His Highness the Sultan of Muscat "qui seront au service des Français" the same protection as to the French themselves, but whereas the owners, masters, and crews of dhows authorized to fly the French flag do not belong to that class of persons, and still less do the members of their families;

Whereas the withdrawal of these persons from the sovereignty, especially from the jurisdiction of His Highness the Sultan of Muscat, would be in contradiction with the Declaration of the 10th March, 1862, by which France and Great Britain engaged themselves reciprocally to respect the independence of this Prince;

For these reasons, decides and pronounces as follows:—

1. Dhows of Muscat authorized as aforesaid to fly the French flag are entitled in the territorial waters of Muscat to the inviolability provided by the French-Muscat Treaty of the 17th November, 1844;

2. The authorization to fly the French flag cannot be transmitted or transferred to any other person or to any other dhow, even if belonging to the same owner;

3. Subjects of the Sultan of Muscat, who are owners or masters of dhows authorized to fly the French flag, or who are members of the crews of such vessels, or who belong to their families, do not enjoy in consequence of that fact any right of extraterritoriality which could exempt them from the sovereignty, especially from the jurisdiction, of His Highness the Sultan of Muscat.

Done at The Hague, in the Permanent Court of Arbitration, August 8, 1905.

(Signed)

H. LAMMASCH.
MELVILLE W. FULLER.
A. F. DE SAVORNIN LOHMAN.

The President speaks as follows:—

"The Award having been given, I only have to thank the Agents and Counsels of the two Parties for having assisted us by their thorough and exact exposition of the *status causa et controversia* in their respective Memoranda, and to thank the Secretaries, in the first place, the Secretary-General of the Permanent Court of Arbitration, Jonkheer Ruyssenaers, whose resignation is a loss of the most profound and grave importance to the Court and to its future work, and also the First Secretary of the International Bureau of the Court, Jonkheer Röell, who by the experience he

has gained in these last years in the procedure of International Arbitration, will represent from now on the actual traditions of this Court.

"Our work being ended, I close the meeting."

The Secretary-General then gives M. Herbette, Agent of the French Republic, and Mr. Ronald Graham, Agent of Great Britain, the certified copy conformable with the Award of the Tribunal destined for their respective Governments.

The meeting closed at 3.30 P.M.

Done at The Hague, August 8th, 1905.

The President,
(Signed) LAMMASCH.
The Secretary-General,
L. H. RUYSSENAERS.
The Secretaries,
GRAND D'HAUTEVILLE.
ROELL.

[French Version not printed.]

No. 45.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir,
I HAVE laid before the Marquess of Lansdowne your letter of the 20th ultimo, forwarding a Report from Major Cox as to the conditions on which the Sheikh of Koweit would be ready to establish a military post on Bubyen Island in the event of the Turkish Government failing to comply with the request for the withdrawal of the Turkish post.

You draw attention to the fact that Major Cox has expressed to Sheikh Mubarak his belief that the British Government will inform the Porte that they have recognized the Sheikh's claim to Bubyen, and had advised him to institute a post there.

In regard to this point Lord Lansdowne desires me to observe that, in my letter of the 22nd May last, no such announcement was at present contemplated. It was, on the contrary, proposed that it should be left to Sir N. O'Connor's discretion to decide at what stage he should make such an intimation, and it is clear, from his Excellency's despatch No. 248 of the 17th April, of which copy was inclosed in my letter, that he was not in favour of any such step for some time to come.

It appears from Major Cox's Report that the Sheikh would desire to establish, not one, but three posts, two upon Bubyen, and one upon an adjacent island, that he would expect His Majesty's Government to pay for the initial cost of their establishment, and for their subsequent maintenance, and that he would desire the permanent residence of a political Agent at Koweit, with occasional visits of a British man-of-war, no doubt as implying that His Majesty's Government would be responsible for defending him from any reprisals to which he might be exposed from the Turkish Government.

Major Cox further suggests that it might be opportune on this occasion to offer the Sheikh an annual subsidy.

You state in your letter that Mr. Brodrick assumes that the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury will be prepared to pay a moiety of the financial assistance which the Sheikh will require, and that he proposes to sanction the deputation of Major Cox to Khor Abdullah, with a view to the selection of posts, should the occasion arise.

I am to state, in reply, that it does not appear to Lord Lansdowne that immediate action in the matter is at all necessary. It would, in his opinion, be expedient that, before any decision is taken, the question should be brought before the Committee of Imperial Defence in connection with that of the eventual terminus of the Bagdad Railway, which is already under the consideration of that Committee.

I am, &c.
(Signed) T. H. SANDERSON.

No. 46.

Memorandum by Mr. Fitzmaurice.—(Received August 10.)

THE India Office's despatch of the 2nd August to the Foreign Office deals with three points:—

(1.) The measures deemed necessary to prevent the "apprehended" total disappearance of the boundary pillars in the neighbourhood of Kataba;

(2.) The question of a formal notification to the Porte that the Amir of Dthala will be directed to raise the British-constructed pillars along his border to a height of 8 feet (as advised by Major Merewether in his letter of the 15th November, 1904); to clear the brush jungle around them and to keep them whitewashed and numbered according to the map; and

(3.) That, pending arrangements of a permanent character, all communications between authorities on either side of the border in regard to disputes in that part of the frontier (*i.e.*, Kataba) should be made through the channel of the Political Officer at Dthala.

The incident which gave rise to this correspondence was at first reported by Major Merewether to have taken place at a spot 3 miles inside the Amir of Dthala's border and looked like a serious violation of British territory. It was subsequently ascertained that it took place at Habil-al-Khadar or on the actual boundary-line, and that (paragraph 2 of the Government of India's letter of the 29th December, 1904, to the Secretary of State for India) the Arabs were settled on the Turkish side of the frontier, but that some of them were pursued an unknown distance across the border by the Turks sent to arrest them. Major Merewether then (in his letter of the 15th November, 1904, to the First Assistant Resident at Aden) commented on the "invisibility from each other of adjoining boundary pillars," and made some suggestions (*e.g.*, raising the height of the pillars to 8 feet, &c.) with a view to preventing the recurrence of such incidents as that reported by him.

The Boundary Commission in its No. 261 of the 26th May, 1903 (I am quoting from memory), pointed out that any boundary-line drawn across the ground in the neighbourhood of Kataba must be defective, but the measures proposed by Major Merewether cannot, I think, prevent the pursuit across the border of fugitive Arabs. Increasing the number of pillars, or heightening the existing ones built by the British will not necessarily prevent pursuing Turkish soldiers or gendarmes from overstepping the border-line.

Again the "visibility of adjoining pillars" seems all but unattainable. Pillars 8 feet high will not be visible over scrub jungle or babul trees 12 feet or more in height, while the natural annual growth of such trees and scrub must also be taken into account. The intervening jungle cannot well be cleared away, as it is valuable to the local Arabs for camel grazing, &c., and its removal would entail endless disputes and a tedious process of indemnifying the owners on both sides.

The distances between the pillars, as given in the Aden Resident's letter of the 18th January, 1905, to the Political Secretary to the Government of Bombay, are very much exaggerated, in one case the distance set down as 2 miles being actually less than a quarter of a mile. In a demi-official letter to the Resident of Aden, confirming my telegram to him of the 1st February, 1905, I pointed this out and gave a comparative table of the distances as reported to him and the actual distances as measured on the boundary map. This was not apparently transmitted to the Government of Bombay.

Again, the Boundary Commission being an international one, Turkish "amour-propre" demanded that a certain proportion of the pillars should be erected by the Turkish Commission. While those built by the British Commission were constructed of cut stone and Portland cement, those built by the Turks were made of rough stone and lime, being consequently less durable. Were the Amir of Dthala to whitewash, number, and raise to 8 feet or more, only the British pillars, the "visibility of adjoining pillars, &c.," would not be secured unless the Turkish authorities could be

[1569]

M^o

induced to alter the pillars built by them in a corresponding fashion, while, as mentioned above, the intervening growth would always be an obstacle.

2. A formal notification to the Turkish authorities concerning the steps which it is intended the Amir of Dthala should take to maintain the pillars in repair, would not, I fear, prove acceptable to the Porte. The Ottoman Government cannot bring itself to look upon any Arab Chief as independent. It has shown the greatest reluctance in official correspondence to apply the title of "Amir" to the Dthala Chief, whom it styles the "Sheikh of Dthala," and it would presumably show a similar reluctance to recognize his acting in an official capacity in such matters as altering, numbering, &c., the boundary pillars.

3. As regards the proposal that the Porte should give general orders to the Sub-Governor of Kataba to communicate officially with the Political Officer at Dthala in matters of border disputes, difficulties are, I fear, to be anticipated also on this score. By accepting the Sultan's proposal to delimit the border between "the nine cantons and the Province of Taiz" instead of the wording of the British Royal Commissions, viz., "the nine tribes and the Ottoman dominions," His Majesty's Government tacitly admitted the friction maintained by the Sultan's Government that the "nine tribes" are in theory "nine cantons," or sub-divisions of the Ottoman Province of Taiz, and though the Porte may profess to instruct the Sub-Governor of Kataba to deal officially with the British appointed Political Officer at Dthala, it is not unlikely that such instructions may prove to be evasive, and that the Kataba Sub-Governor will limit his correspondence with the Political Officer at Dthala to informing the latter that he has forwarded his communications to Sana'a or Constantinople.

It would then seem that any unilateral action by us or the Amir of Dthala is likely to be objected to by the Turks, while any joint alteration or improvement of the existing boundary marks will involve procuring an Imperial Iradé from the Sultan.

Now that the boundary has been laid down and drawn on detailed survey maps any encroachments by the Turks are out of the question, but border incidents such as the violation of, or trespass on the existing boundary, especially in cases of the pursuit of fugitive Arabs, may from time to time occur, though they may not always lead to serious questions.

When the boundary was being fixed in the neighbourhood of Kataba and the Dakkam, the British Commission succeeded in including on the British side of the line some tracts which at certain seasons of the year become marshy and are frequented by small game, as it was felt that any officers stationed at Dthala might be tempted to cross to the Turkish side of the frontier, thus leading to incidents perhaps of a serious nature. Even still, as these marshes are in close proximity to the border-line, it is not impossible that British officers at Dthala may occasionally be led to overstep the Turkish boundary in pursuing game. It may then be expedient on the whole, that minor trespasses across a boundary which is totally unlike any European frontier, should not, where possible, assume the character of international incidents but should be adjusted on the spot by unofficial friendly communication between the local British and Turkish officials. Should we adopt a rigid attitude in matters of minor trespass by the Turks, the latter may retaliate and their methods in such cases are distinctly rougher than ours.

I cannot help feeling that had the actual facts been at first correctly reported by Major Merewether and the correct distances between the pillars given, the present correspondence might not have arisen.

The foregoing remarks must, I fear, appear to be almost entirely of a negative character. But the measures suggested by Major Merewether to prevent the recurrence of an incident at first incorrectly reported to him would not, I think, have the desired effect, while the consent of the Sultan to any alteration of the existing boundary, especially by the Amir of Dthala, can only be obtained by tedious negotiation and the exercise of pressure.

(Signed) G. H. FITZMAURICE.

London, August 8, 1905.

No. 46.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir,

Foreign Office, August 9, 1905.

I AM directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to transmit herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State for India, copy of a despatch from His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople,* inclosing copy of a letter which has been addressed to him by the Government of India on the subject of certain discrepancies pointed out by Captain Tandy between the descriptions and the maps signed by the Aden Boundary Commissioners. These discrepancies have been submitted, by Lord Lansdowne's direction, to Mr. Fitzmaurice, and the observations of that gentleman are contained in a Memorandum of which a copy is inclosed.†

The explanations made by Mr. Fitzmaurice seem to show that no misunderstanding is likely to arise on account of the points brought forward by Captain Tandy.

If Mr. Secretary Brodrick concurs in this view, Lord Lansdowne would propose, in view of the undesirability of raising any fresh discussion with the Turks, that Sir N. O'Connor should be authorized to inform the Government of India, in reply to their letter, that there does not appear to be sufficient necessity for altering the descriptions signed by the joint Commissioners, and that the printing of the maps should be proceeded with.

I am, &c.
(Signed) F. H. VILLIERS.

No. 47.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received August 12.)

WITH reference to Foreign Office letter of to-day's date, the Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copies of telegrams to the Viceroy, dated the 9th and 10th instant, relative to the Muscat Arbitration Award.

India Office, August 11, 1905.

Inclosure 1 in No. 47.

Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

India Office, August 9, 1905.

MUSCAT Arbitration.

Terms of Award, as given in official English translation, are as follows:—

"1. Before the 2nd January, 1892, date of ratification of General Act of Brussels Conference, France was entitled to authorize vessels belonging to subjects of Sultan of Muscat to fly French flag, only bound by her own legislation and administrative rules.

"2. Owners of dhows, who have been before 1892 authorized by France to fly French flag, retain this authorization as long as France renews it to grantee.

"3. After the 2nd January, 1892, France was not entitled to authorize vessels belonging to subjects of Sultan of Muscat to fly French flag, except on condition that their owners, or fitters out, had established, or should establish, that they had been considered and treated by France as her protégés before 1863.

"4. Muscat dhows authorized, as above stated, to fly French flag are entitled in Muscat territorial waters to inviolability provided by French Muscat Treaty of the 17th November, 1844.

"5. The authorization to fly French flag cannot be transmitted or transferred to any other person or dhow, even if belonging to same owner.

"6. Subjects of Sultan of Muscat who are the owners or masters of dhows authorized to fly French flag, or who are members of crews of such vessels, or who

* No. 25.

† No. 36.

belong to their families, do not enjoy, in consequence of that fact, any right of exterritoriality which could exempt them from sovereignty, especially from jurisdiction, of Sultan of Muscat."

First three paragraphs refer to question of issue of French flags, last three paragraphs refer to nature of privileges claimed (*vide* paragraph 2 of Compromis of the 13th October, 1904). Await further telegram from me.

Inclosure 2 in No. 47.

Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

India Office, August 10, 1905.

MUSCAT Award.

I shall be glad to be furnished with your observations on terms of Award (text of which has been telegraphed to you *en clair*), and also with expression of your views as to the steps which should be taken at Muscat with a view to regularizing situation there in accordance with the Award. Before any action is taken it may be desirable to apprise the French Government of our intentions, and I request that no action may be taken locally without previous reference to me. Terms of Award may, however, be communicated to the Sultan.

No. 48.

Memorandum communicated to Musurus Pasha, August 12, 1905.

INQUIRIES have been made with regard to the guard-house or other building which the Turkish Ambassador in his conversations with Lord Lansdowne on the 8th and 15th March represented as having been erected by British naval officers on the mainland opposite the Manama district of the Island of Bahrein.

The reports which His Majesty's Government have received from their officials on the Persian Gulf show that no such buildings have been erected by British officers in the locality named.

The only building operations in the vicinity of Bahrein with which British officers have recently been connected are: the construction of a temporary rifle range and stop-butt on Sitra Island, one of the Bahrein group, east of and adjacent to the chief island, on which Manama is situated; the erection of a guard-house for the accommodation of the military guard of the British Agent at Bahrein itself; and the placing of a beacon in the sea near Muharraf Island for the guidance of navigators.

None of these can in any way be represented as an infringement of the rights of the Ottoman Government, and if the information received by the Sublime Porte had no other foundation than an incorrect version of these incidents, the complaint made by the Turkish Ambassador must be considered as belonging to that category of charges brought against the British authorities by the Turkish local officials on the shores of the Persian Gulf to which Lord Lansdowne referred in the protest which he made to Musurus Pasha on the 1st March last.

Foreign Office, August 12, 1905.

No. 49.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 257.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, August 12, 1905.

WITH reference to Mr. Townley's despatch No. 90 of the 7th February last, I transmit to your Excellency herewith copy of a letter from the India Office inclosing a telegram from the Viceroy reporting that the notorious pirate Ahmad-bin-Selman has again been committing piracies in the Persian Gulf.

• No. 34.

I request that your Excellency will make a further representation to the Porte with a view to effective steps being taken to suppress such acts in those waters.

I am, &c.

(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 50.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir A. Hardinge.

(No. 119.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, August 12, 1905.

I HAVE received your despatch No. 139, Confidential, of the 21st June last, reporting a conversation with the Mushir-ed-Dowleh respecting the status of Koweit Arabs in Persia.

I approve your language to his Excellency on this occasion.

I am, &c.

(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 51.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir,

Foreign Office, August 12, 1905.

I AM directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 2nd instant inclosing copy of a telegram from the Viceroy on the subject of the flag-staffs on the Maklab Isthmus and Sheep and Telegraph Islands.

I am to state that Lord Lansdowne concurs in the terms of the telegram which Mr. Secretary Brodrick proposes to address to the Viceroy in reply.

I am, &c.

(Signed) F. H. VILLIERS.

No. 52.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received August 14.)

(No. 544.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, August 7, 1905.

WITH reference to my telegram No. 108 of the 31st ultimo, I have the honour to forward to your Lordship herewith copies of despatches from His Majesty's Consul at Jeddah, reporting on the death of the Grand Shereef.

I have, &c.

(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

Inclosure 1 in No. 52.

Consul Devey to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 76.)

Sir,

Jeddah, July 20, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to report that his Highness the Grand Shereef passed away at Tayif on the 17th instant. The serious nature of the malady from which his Highness was unfortunately suffering has prepared public opinion for the shock of his loss, and was commented upon by Vice-Consul Dr. S. M. Husain so long ago as October 1903, and again in January of this year.

I had thoughts of hoisting the flag half-mast over this Consulate as a sign of respectful mourning, but as this is not the received practice in Turkey this was not done; a letter of condolence, however, was written to Awun Rafik's son at Tayif. His Highness' obsequies were performed with proper ceremonies and gun-fire at Tayif, and the military band has ceased playing here for three days. Ali Pasha, the deceased's nephew, is for the time being carrying on the work of the "Amanat-i-Jelile," for which he is fully qualified, while it is rumoured and quite credible that Shereef Abdilla is to come at once from the capital and rule at Mecca in place of his deceased brother.

[1569]

N

As mentioned in my despatch No. 75 (inclosure), some of the late Shereef's recent doings or omissions have not given satisfaction to those around him, and the misunderstandings with Ali Pasha were to be regretted, but happily the ultimate outcome of the questions in dispute has not been very serious. Presumably large allowances should be made for the trying and constantly failing state of his Highness' health.

I have, &c.
(Signed) G. P. DEVEY.

Inclosure 2 in No. 52.

Consul Devey to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 77. Confidential.)

Sir, Jeddah, July 26, 1905.
HIS Highness the Grand Shereef has been reposing in the tomb for just a week, but despite the saying "de mortuis," one cannot but note that the passing of the Shereefate administration into the more vigorous hands of Ali Pasha temporarily has been hailed with relief by the majority of Hejaz Notables and merchants and Bedouin Chiefs.

Possibly the physical state of coma and apathy into which his Highness' health had fallen had affected his mental and moral capacities. In any case his methods of rule had been growing markedly more and more unpopular of late.

It is reported that his successor (as yet apparent but not designate), Shereef Abdilla, was to leave Constantinople forthwith, but that his Highness is also of advanced age and in ailing health. Should he proceed here it is to be hoped he will accord a large measure of confidence and good-will to his nephew, and be ready to take advantage of his practical experience and high influence in this country. However, in view of the shocking catastrophe at last Friday's Selamluk and the consequent changes now being made among important functionaries at the capital, possibly the nomination may be retarded. And, if so, the charge of the Shereefate is certainly in good hands. For the present all good things are expected from Ali Pasha's sense of justice and established consideration. The proverb as to "new brooms" does not apply here, and much wrong has already been righted.

His Highness Awun Rafik is reported to have left 40,000*l.* in cash, and his estate has passed to his family. Some of his Mecca protégés have received rather summary treatment; notably one Bo Effendi has been discarded from favour, and is likely to be deprived of the use of houses and property rather lavishly bestowed on him by the deceased Shereef.

I have, &c.
(Signed) G. P. DEVEY.

No. 53.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received August 14.)

(No. 547.)

My Lord,

Therapia, August 8, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 513 of the 26th ultimo, I have the honour to transmit herewith to your Lordship copies of two despatches which I have received from His Majesty's Vice-Consul at Hodeida, reporting the arrival of transports and troops for service in the Yemen, and the commencement of a general forward movement against Sana'a by the Turkish troops under the supreme command of Marshal Ahmed Feizi Pasha, operating simultaneously from Menakha, Taiz, and Kufi.

This forward movement against the insurgents appears to be in obedience to orders received from Constantinople following on the failure of Mahmoud Nedim Bey to arrive at an amicable settlement with the Imam.

On the 2nd instant an official communiqué in the Constantinople press published the text of two telegrams addressed by the President of the Yemen Reform Commission to the Minister of War, relative to the progress of the operations.

In the first, Marshal Feizi Pasha reports that on the 19th July three battalions of troops with two guns marched from Menakha and reached a place near Beit-el-Medhi in the neighbourhood of Berj Zahid, where the rebels were in force.

On nearing Beit-el-Medhi the necessary dispositions for an attack were made,

the enemy's line extending for 3 kilom. from the Sana'a road. At 4 o'clock the attack was commenced, and the rebels were repulsed with much slaughter to Mifhak.

In the second telegram the Marshal reports that he arrived at Beit-el-Medhi on the 30th July, and proceeded to occupy one of the important positions on the Sanfour road, and to reduce to order other points on the pass. He then decided that it was essential that the village of Beit-el-Joridi (Hujeila) on the Sanfour road, should be captured as it had been adopted by Seid Hashim, the representative of the rebel leader, as the centre of the revolt and fortified, his camp being only two hours' distant, and the place consequently formed the key to Mifhak.

At 9 o'clock on the morning of the 30th ultimo, three Turkish battalions with two guns attacked the rebels, who were entrenched along a line of 4 kilom., and after four hours' fierce fighting, completely routed and dispersed them.

On the side of the insurgents Mohsni-el-Ayrab and other notorious rebel leaders were killed. The losses on the side of the Imperial troops in killed and wounded were very slight.

I also inclose copy of a despatch from the Military Attaché to His Majesty's Embassy commenting on the progress made by the Yemen expeditionary force, and reporting the dispatch of further troops to the front and the mobilization of Hamidieh Regiments at Sivas and in the district of Lake Van.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONNOR.

Inclosure 1 in No. 53.

Vice-Consul Richardson to Consul Devey.

(No. 90.)

Sir,

Hodeida, July 15, 1905.

PREPARATIONS have been made during the past four weeks ever since the arrival of Marshal Ahmed Fezi Pasha to commence a general advance from three directions against the insurgents.

I now learn that a forward movement is intended from Menakha, Taiz, and Kufi simultaneously within the course of the next few days.

A considerable quantity of provisions and munitions have been landed from Turkish transports since the beginning of the month. Four batteries of field artillery have also arrived from Constantinople, and about 300 gunners to reinforce the depleted batteries.

The above, with some 1,600 transport mules imported from Constantinople and Asia Minor, have been dispatched to Menakha.

Two battalions have also been moved to Taiz and two others transported to Cumfuda for service in Assyr.

The Taiz force will be commanded by Brigadier-General Ghalib Pasha and the division operating from Kufi by Liwa Yussuf Pasha, both co-operating in the advance against Sana'a from Menakha with the main army under Marshal Ahmed Fezi Pasha.

Both Ahmed Fezi and Marshal Shakir Pasha transferred their respective headquarters to Menakha some three weeks ago on the return to that place from Sana'a of the Adjoint of the Governor-General Mahmoud Nedim Bey.

The latter, it will be remembered, proceeded to Sana'a by Imperial Iradé during the first week of last month to conduct negotiations with the Imam with a view to affecting some amicable understanding.

It would appear from information that has reached this town from merchants residing at Sana'a that Mahmoud Bey did not personally see the Imam. He was met outside the surrendered capital by the latter's representative and escorted to Raudah, a town about 5 miles north of Sana'a, where the Imam was residing at the time.

Written communications passed between the Imam and Mahmoud Bey, the Agent of the Ottoman Government, for nearly a week, but without result.

Although the Imam was personally in favour of a peaceful settlement with the Turks, his advisers and the principal Sheikhs opposed the same.

I learn from a reliable source that the Imam was at last only willing to return Sana'a to the Sultan and desist from further rebellion on the cession to him of the towns of Damar, Yerim, Hajje, Taweela, Kaukaban, and Amran. There were other minor

demands, but of course the Ottoman Government could under no circumstances admit of any agreement on the above basis.

It is generally believed that orders have now arrived from Constantinople for a general movement against the insurgents.

During the past five or six weeks reports have constantly been received here of the assassination of more than twenty of the principal Sheikhs of the various districts in which the Arab rebellion has been organized.

Among the chieftains disposed of may be mentioned the Sheikhs of Mefaq, Suk-el-Khamis, Aniz, Bilad Bustan, and Hashid.

There are rumours current that some of the above have been poisoned and others killed by orders of the Imam: whereas certain other sources attribute the assassinations to the influence of secret intrigues of Ahmed Fezi Pasha.

Two or three petty encounters with the insurgents near Hujjeila and Menakha have been reported recently, in which the Albanian troops successfully repelled the attacks of the rebel tribesmen, and in some instances punished them severely.

The authorities officially confirm the news that arrived from Cumfuda on the 5th instant of the Arabs of Assyr having attacked the Turkish garrison at Abha, but were totally unsuccessful; two brothers of the Sheikh of the province being taken prisoners. The loss on the Turkish side was 2 officers and 25 men killed, whereas it is stated that the Arabs suffered very severely, having over 100 killed and many more were taken prisoners.

I have, &c.
(Signed) G. A. RICHARDSON.

Inclosure 2 in No. 53.

Vice-Consul Richardson to Consul Devey.

(No. 91.)

Sir,

Hodeida, July 17, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to report the following movements of Turkish troops and transports in this district recently:—

1. The steam-ship "Alexandria," flying the Ottoman flag, arrived on the 9th instant from Constantinople and landed 300 mules and a large quantity of military stores and provisions. She also disembarked 300 recruits taken aboard at Smyrna. Liwa Bakhtiyar Pasha, newly appointed to command at Hodeida, arrived by the above vessel that sailed again yesterday for Trebizond.

2. The hired transport, "Nijni Novgorod," of the Russian Volunteer fleet, anchored in the roadstead on the 11th. She brought 7,600 cases of ammunition from Constantinople, 267 mules and horses, and 263 artillery drafts. Liwa Ishak Pasha, Sanitary Inspector of the Yemen, came here by the "Novgorod" that also sailed yesterday for Odessa.

3. The transport "Hodeida," of the Mahsoussi Company, arrived on the 13th from Constantinople conveying 432 recruits and 498 mules for this district. The vessel proceeded to Camaran for disinfection, and is expected to return to-morrow when she will land her troops. 8,000 packages of stores and provisions were disembarked from the vessel.

4. The transport "Kaplan," whose arrival here has already been reported, took on board 750 redifs from Hodeida for Assyr and sailed for Cumfuda on the 14th instant.

I have, &c.
(Signed) G. A. RICHARDSON.

Inclosure 3 in No. 53.

Lieutenant-Colonel Maunsell to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 48.)

Sir,

Therapia, August 8, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to report as follows on the progress of events in the Yemen:—

The Mushir Ahmed Fezi Pasha, who has now been given civil as well as military control in the country, finding it necessary to move forward from Menakha, has reached

Mefhak, some 10 miles along the Sana'a road, having driven the insurgents out of rocky fortified positions at Beit-el-Mehdi and Ijz.

Now, however, the Mushir thinks it advisable to await the arrival of reinforcements on their way from Smyrna and Alexandretta before moving further towards Sana'a.

Meanwhile, Shakir Pasha has moved to Sanfur, south-west of Menakha, in the Wadi Saham, a broad valley up which he hopes to open another route towards Sana'a, parallel to the Menakha line.

The column from Taiz, under Liwa Riza Pasha, has made a successful advance to Yerin, on the road to Sana'a, but also has been obliged to await reinforcements.

Throughout the insurgents have fought with great determination and courage.

The Turkish troops experience very great difficulty as regards food supplies, as after the famine of last year little remains in the country, while the rebels have drawn off all they can towards Sana'a.

Provisions have, therefore, to be forwarded from Constantinople, Smyrna, and Mersina to Hodeida by the Government transports.

Of the expected reinforcements, eight battalions of the Tokat Redif Brigade have just left Smyrna on two transports hired from the Pacquet Company, of Marseilles.

Of the others, making sixteen in all, four of the Kharput Redif Brigade have reached Alexandretta and will embark on Government transports.

The 63rd Hamidieh Cavalry Regiment from Sivas under its Chief, Mihr Ali, has, after several orders and counter-orders, been mobilized, received a special banner, and message from the Sultan and has moved by Kaisarie to Alexandretta, which will be reached in a few days.

The regiment numbers 600 men and this is the first instance of any of these troops being mobilized as a regiment or of proceeding on active service.

The four Hamidieh regiments under Hussein Pasha, of Patnotz, near Lake Van, have also been mobilized to the number of 600, and these will go to Erzuigan for a course of training, after which they can go on to Yemen if required.

I have, &c.
(Signed) F. R. MAUNSELL, Lieutenant-Colonel,
Military Attaché.

No. 54.

Foreign Office to Treasury.

Sir,

Foreign Office, August 14, 1905.

WITH reference to the letters from this Department of the 31st July, 1903, and the 23rd February, 1905, and to your letters of the 1st March and the 18th July last, I am directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to state, for the information of the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury, that the Muscat Arbitration Tribunal met at The Hague on the 25th July last and delivered its Award on the 8th instant.

The three Arbitrators chosen to officiate on this occasion, under the Anglo-French Compromise of the 13th October, 1904, were Mr. Melville W. Fuller, Chief Justice of the United States of America, as British Arbitrator; M. Savornin Lohman, ex-Minister of the Interior at The Hague and Member of the Dutch Second Chamber, as French Arbitrator; and Professor Lammasch, Member of the Austrian Upper Chamber, selected by the King of Italy to act as Umpire.

His Majesty's Government and the French Government decided that, in accordance with recent precedents, each of the three Arbitrators should receive for their services a fee of 1,000*l.*, and that Messrs. Lammasch and Fuller should be reimbursed for any expenses of locomotion or maintenance incurred by them in connection with the arbitration. In the case of M. Lohman, who resides at The Hague, this latter provision was unnecessary.

Messrs. Lammasch and Fuller were accordingly requested to furnish an estimate of their expenses. It was not, however, possible for them to do so until a decision had been reached as to how long the proceedings would last, and this point was only definitely determined during their final discussions. It was not, therefore, until Monday last, the 7th instant, that Lord Lansdowne received information from the British Agent on the arbitration, that Mr. Fuller estimated his expenses at 500*l.*, and M. Lammasch placed his at 200*l.*

[1569]

O

It is customary that the Arbitrators' fees, &c., should be paid in to the Secretary-General of the International Tribunal on the morning of the day on which the final Award is delivered. This was fixed for the following afternoon, that of the 8th instant, and it therefore became necessary to authorize His Majesty's Minister at The Hague by telegraph to pay into Court the British share of the sum involved. A similar authority was telegraphed to the French Minister at The Hague by the French Government, and the total sum necessary, viz., 3,500l., was paid over to the Court on the 8th August by the British and French Ministers acting simultaneously. A receipt was given by the Secretary-General for the British share, viz., 46,250 fr. (1,850l.).

I am to express the hope that the Lords Commissioners will grant their sanction to this expenditure.

Their Lordships are aware from the correspondence which passed in February last, that in addition to the 250l. granted to Mr. W. F. Craies for preparing the British Case, it is necessary to provide further remuneration for his services in drawing up the British Counter Case and Argument. These documents were prepared with much skill and to the entire satisfaction of His Majesty's Government. Lord Lansdowne would suggest, for the consideration of the Lords Commissioners, that Mr. Craies should receive an inclusive fee of 100 guineas for the preparation of the Counter Case, and of 150 guineas for preparing the Argument. I am to request that, if their Lordships agree, sanction may be given to the payment to Mr. Craies of the sum of 250 guineas at as early a date as possible.

I am, &c.
(Signed) F. H. VILLIERS.

No. 55.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir, *Foreign Office, August 14, 1905.*
I LAID before the Marquess of Lansdowne your letter of the 5th instant, respecting the proposed visit of the Resident at Aden to Berbera and Jibuti, in connection with the question of the traffic in arms in the Red Sea.

His Lordship is of opinion that the course proposed by the Resident is most desirable, more especially in view of the desire expressed by the Governor of Jibuti for co-operation and consultation with the British authorities.

Copies of recent correspondence with the French Embassy, the Italian Ambassador, and His Majesty's Ambassador at Paris are inclosed for Mr. Secretary Brodrick's information,* from which it will be seen that Sir F. Bertie has been instructed to join with his Italian colleague in making renewed representations to the French Government on the subject, the reply of the French Government to the representations already made (see my letter of the 30th January) not being considered satisfactory.

I am, &c.
(Signed) F. H. VILLIERS.

No. 56.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received August 16.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of inclosures in a letter from the Foreign Secretary to the Government of India, dated the 13th ultimo, relative to the report that the Sheikh of Bahrein had declared himself a Turkish subject.

India Office, August 15, 1905.

* See Part III, Nos. 80 and 81; and *ante*, Nos. 19 and 20 A.

No. 55^c.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 269.)

Sir, *Foreign Office, August 15, 1905.*

WITH reference to your Excellency's despatch No. 438 of the 25th June, relative to the construction of more easily distinguishable marks of the Aden boundary line near Kataba, I have to inform you that I consulted Mr. Fitzmaurice with regard to the proposal, the adoption of which was recommended by your Excellency, that the Amir of Dhala should raise the height of those pillars along his frontier which require it.

I transmit herewith a copy of a letter to the India Office, embodying the views of Mr. Fitzmaurice, together with a copy of the letter in reply which has been received from that Department.*

Your Excellency will observe that Mr. Fitzmaurice fears that any interference on the part of the Amir with the pillars will immediately result in his being accused by the Turks of tampering with the boundary.

The Government of India, however, adhere to their view, and would insist on the annual repair of the pillars being made the duty of the Amir of Dhala, in order that the benefit of the demarcation just concluded should not be lost. They suggest that the difficulties anticipated by Mr. Fitzmaurice might be obviated by a formal notification to the Turkish authorities. I have to request that your Excellency will furnish me with your views with regard to the suggested notification, and to the manner in which it should be made.

A copy of a Memorandum by Mr. Fitzmaurice on the last communication from the India Office is also inclosed.†

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

* Nos. 8* and 35*.
† No. 46*.

Inclosure 1 in No. 56.

Major Newmarch to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

May 19, 1905.

PLEASE refer to your telegram No. 1847 E.B. About six weeks ago I heard that the Sheikh of Bahrein had fled to Koweit, and I have just heard that he has gone thence to join Ibn Rashid, but the report of his having declared himself a Turkish subject is not confirmed up to the present moment.

Inclosure 2 in No. 56.

Major Cox to Mr. Fraser.

Bushire, June 4, 1905.

Sir,

IN continuation of Captain Trevor's letter of the 27th May, I have the honour to forward a further communication from the Political Agent, Bahrein, on the subject of the rumour regarding Sheikh Esa having declared himself as being a subject of Turkey.

I trust the Government of India will instruct me if they consider that any communication should be made to the Sheikh on the subject.

The letter No. 174 quoted in paragraph 5 of the inclosure is in reference to Sheikh Ali-bin-Ahmed. Sheikh Esa, in sending the Political Agent a copy of a communication which he has received from his nephew, writes that he fears that if Sheikh Ali does not receive a communication to the effect that his case will be favourably considered he may possibly take up "some revolutionary ideas and approach another Government with requests."

I can hardly suppose that His Majesty's Government would recognize Sheikh Ali as the subject of any foreign Power, whether Turkey or some other, under any circumstances.

Possibly, however, the Commander of the troops at Bagdad may have been told of Sheikh Ali's readiness to become a Turkish subject, and then substituted Sheikh Esa's name for Sheikh Ali's.

I have, &c.

(Signed) P. Z. COX.

Inclosure 3 in No. 56.

Government of India to Major Cox.

Sir,

Simla, July 12, 1905.

I AM directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letters marginally cited,^a respecting the statement communicated by the Turkish Ambassador in London to the effect that Sheikh Esa of Bahrein had declared himself to be a Turkish subject.

Although the evidence that Sheikh Esa is intriguing with any foreign country is not at present strong enough to justify any remonstrance, the Government of India are of opinion that there need be no hesitation in letting the Chief know unofficially that his proceedings are being watched.

You are accordingly authorized to make an intimation to Sheikh Esa to that effect, should you and the Political Agent agree that it is likely to be useful in effectively stopping any negotiations with M. Peronne or Mahomed-bin-Abdul Wahab Pasha, which Sheikh Esa might be tempted to continue if he thought that his proceedings were unknown.

I have, &c.

(Signed) C. SOMERS COCKS.

^a May 27, and June 4, 10, and 17, 1905.

No. 57.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received August 16.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of inclosures in a letter from the Foreign Secretary to the Government of India, dated the 13th July, relative to the Aden delimitation.

It is requested that these papers, which are sent in original, may be returned to this Office as soon as done with.

India Office, August 15, 1905.

Inclosure 1 in No. 57.

Government of Bombay to Government of India.

Sir, *Bombay Castle, June 19, 1905.*
WITH reference to this Department telegram, dated the 6th April, 1905, and to Major-General Mason's letter, dated the 7th May, 1905, to your address, relative to the Aden Boundary Delimitation Commission, I am directed to forward herewith copy of a letter, dated the 4th June, 1905, from the Political Resident, Aden, with accompaniments, relative to the question whether Juban is within the sphere of the British Government, together with copy of Government letter, dated the 16th June, 1905, on the subject.

I have, &c.
(Signed) S. W. EDGERLEY,
Chief Secretary to Government.

Inclosure 2 in No. 57.

Political Resident, Aden, to Government of Bombay.

Sir, *Aden Residency, June 4, 1905.*
IN forwarding herewith notes of an interview held by Captain Jacob on the 19th May, 1905, with one of the Sheikhs of Juban, I have the honour to, at the same time, forward copy of a Memorandum on the subject submitted to me by my Acting First Assistant on the 29th May, and to state that I propose, with the approval of Government, to direct Captain Jacob to restrict further action, for the present, to such further inquiry as may not be incompatible with an attitude of general acceptance for the time being of the recent settlement.

2. It is possible that the outcome of present hostilities in Yemen may so affect the general situation on this portion of the boundary as to facilitate the adjustment which the Political Officer at Dthala already reports as desirable. And this is a possibility which I think should be carefully borne in mind.

I have, &c.
(Signed) H. M. MASON, Major-General.

Inclosure 3 in No. 57.

Conversation between Captain Jacob and Ahmad Bubakar 'Abdul Rab on May 19, 1905.

(Confidential.)

AHMAD BUBAKAR 'ABDUL RAB, one of the Sheikhs of Juban, came in to interview me yesterday.

I hinted to him that he was not within our sphere, so far as I know, and that it was possible he might at the time of delimitation pass definitely within the Turkish side of the border.

He replied he hoped this would not be so; he disliked the Turks cordially; wished to be incorporated into our sphere and now believed that he would incur the displeasure

of the Turks for having come to Dthala; that formerly there was a Turkish official in Juban who was murdered by the Arabs; that he had formerly accepted the invitation of the British Government and gone down to Aden in company with other Sheikhs of Juban, and he was now between the devil and the deep sea.

Of Na'wa, he said it was really independent, but at one time belonged to Juban, and might even now be claimed as a part and parcel of the latter, though the present relations were strained by reason of a blood-feud.

He said that Juban, Na'wa, and Dthubiyani were interdependent ("Tila").

I gave him 20 rupees and 6 rupees to his companions. He asked for a pass for arms to Aden. He will probably ask for presents. I have pointed out to him that the less his commerce with us at this juncture the better for him in respect of his apprehensions above stated.

If Juban passes into Turkish hands and Na'wa and Dthubiyani remain on our side of the border, there will be, I prophesy, constant friction on the border.

Rubeaten is clearly under Sultan Kahtan-bin-Omar. Na'wa and Dthubiyani are claimed by the Nakibs of Mausatta. Their claim may have little foundation in fact, but the sympathies of the last two are with us, and all including Juban, are "Halafa" of Upper Yafa and vice versa, i.e., if any of the coterie wish for armed assistance, the others will give it.

(Signed) H. F. JACOB, Captain,
Political Officer, Dthala.

Dthala, May 19, 1905.

With compliments to First Assistant Resident, Aden, for the information of the Resident.

(Signed) H. F. JACOB, Captain,
Political Officer, Dthala.

Dthala, May 19, 1905.

Inclosure 4 in No. 57.

Memorandum respecting Interview between Captain Jacob and Ahmad Bubakar 'Abdul Rab, one of the Sheikhs of Juban, on May 19, 1905.

IN the Marquess of Lansdowne's despatch to Mr. Townley, No. 41, dated the 7th February, 1905 (Foreign Office, "Arabia, February 7, Section 1"), it is stated "that His Majesty's Government consider that the districts known as Dthabiani, Juban, Naawa, and Rubeaten are dependencies of the Yaffai, one of the nine British cantons, but that they reserve a final decision upon this point for the Commission which will delimitate the frontier from Lakmat-es-Shub north east, to the desert in virtue of the Imperial Irade of the 13th February, 1903."

On the 15th March, 1905, the Secretary of State telegraphed to the Viceroy, that "the Vali will be sent instructions to the effect that delimitation of Yaffai frontier is to be proceeded with in due course by the Boundary Commission. Rubeaten and other places, so far as they may be proved to be Yaffai will be covered by this arrangement."

On the 20th March, 1905, Mr. Fitzmaurice telegraphed to His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople:—

"It would seem that Juban is a stumbling-block of settlement of boundary north-east, in consequence of its being the administrative centre of a canton."

And on the 4th April, 1905, he telegraphed:—

"If I forego claim to Juban, Turkish Commissioner can give up claims to the other three places."

2. On the 6th April, 1905, his Excellency the Governor of Bombay telegraphed to the Viceroy expressing concurrence with the suggested compromise to cede Juban in consideration of cession of the other three places. In his telegram to the Foreign Office of the 4th April, His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople also expressed approval of the compromise as, from the information in his possession, seeming advantageous.

[1569]

P

On the 15th April the compromise was accepted by the Viceroy, and on the 18th April Mr. Fitzmaurice was informed that His Majesty's Government accepted arrangement in regard to Subaihi frontier, and that he might sign the *procès-verbal*, which he accordingly did on the 20th April.

3. Turning to the *procès-verbal* of the 20th April, it appears that Mr. Fitzmaurice states that "the documents and other proofs furnished by the Sheikhs of Yaffa establish indisputably that the places called Rubeaten, Naawa, and Dthabiani form part of the Canton of Yaffa, while the Aulaki (plural Awalik) with all their sub-divisions and dependencies, as also all other Yaffa districts lying to the south and east to the aforesaid north-east line belong to the 'nine cantons.'" Mr. Fitzmaurice makes no mention of Juban. But Colonel Mustapha Remzi Bey replies that "provided the Uzle of Juban remains part of the Caza of Rada, he recognizes that the Uzles of Rubeaten, Naawa, and Dthabiani form part of the Canton of Yaffa, and that the Awalik, with all their sub-divisions and dependencies, as also all other Yaffa districts lying to the south and east of the above north-east line belong to the 'nine cantons.'"

4. Thus, although Mr. Fitzmaurice has not expressly surrendered Yaffai's right to Juban, the Ottoman Commissioner's admission that Rubeaten, Naawa, and Dthabiani belong to Yaffai is conditional on Juban remaining part of the Kaza of Rada.

5. Thus, although there remains a possibility of the Juban question being reopened should the circumstances of the case ever render it expedient to do so, it appears that this must of necessity entail also a reopening of the Rubeaten, Naawa, and Dthabiani questions. And in regard to this, paragraph 12 of Mr. Fitzmaurice's letter to the Government of India, dated Perim, 30th April, calls for very careful consideration.

6. From this it appears that in obtaining the recognition by the Turks that Rubeaten, Naawa, and Dthabiani are Yaffai, we are obtaining more than the status of 1901, which was the accepted basis of demarcation warranted. And it further appears that though, according to the document inclosed in the Boundary Commissioner's No. 340 of the 26th October, 1903, Rubeaten was so indisputably Yaffai that it could not have been left to the Turks without a loss of prestige *vis-à-vis* our tribesmen, Yaffai connection with the other places was much weaker.

7. From this it would appear, *prima facie*, injudicious to reopen the Juban question, unless and until we are so armed with further documentary or other evidence of an irrefutable nature as to unquestionably establish our claims on both Juban and Naawa and Dthabiani, in face of the facts that in 1901 all these places were considered Turkish, and that in the Residency records of 1894 Rubeaten, Naawa, and Juban were actually mentioned as being within Turkish limits. And it may therefore be premised that it would be injudicious to, for the present at any rate, attempt any reopening of the question unless circumstances of quite exceptional urgency and importance render it imperative to do so.

8. From the notes of Captain Jacob's interview, dated the 19th May, 1905, with Sheikh Ahmed Bubakr 'Abdul Rab, of Juban, it appears that that Sheikh admits that formerly there was a Turkish official in Juban, and further expresses fear that he will incur the displeasure of the Turks by his recent visit to Dthala. He is thus impliedly under Turkish suzerainty.

He wishes, however, to be incorporated in our sphere of influence, and considers that he has already taken a step in that direction by his visit to Aden last year.

He states that Juban, Naawa, and Dthabiani are allied, or according to the Arabic expression, "Hulafa," the signification of which is that there is a sort of offensive and defensive alliance between them.

Captain Jacob prophesies friction if Juban passes into Turkish hands while Naawa and Dthabiani remain with us.

9. Turning to the Residency records there is practically nothing on the subject between 1894, when, as Mr. Fitzmaurice says, Rubeaten, Naawa, and Juban were actually mentioned as being within Turkish limits, and the autumn of 1903, when there is a brief demi-official correspondence between General Maitland and Colonel Wahab concerning certain letters addressed to two of the leading members of the family of Sultan Kahtan of Upper Yaffai, which were somehow intercepted before arrival at their destination. These letters purported to emanate from one Kadi Mahomed Ali, of Juban, and a certain Sheikh Saleh-bin-Saleh Jairi, of Rada, and conveyed sentiments distinctly hostile to us, congratulating the two Sheikhs Saleh-bin-Omar and Haidara-bin-Mahomed of Upper Yaffai on their successful resistance

of the Christians, and inviting them to proceed to Rada with a view to receiving presents from the Turkish authorities there. Colonel Wahab took the view that the correspondence was not of much importance, and mainly resulted from the desire of the Kadi of Juban, whom he described as a wily person not unfriendly to us, to appease the irritation of the Turks at our advance into Rubeaten and Naawa, from which we had subsequently withdrawn. But General Maitland considered that the matter was of importance, as it was precisely the way in which a Turkish intrigue with the Yaffai would be commenced.

10. Nothing further appears until the beginning of 1904, when there is a letter, dated the 16th January, 1904, from the late Captain Warneford to certain four Sheikhs of Juban, including Sheikh Ahmed Bubakr, whom Captain Jacob has recently interviewed, in which a letter received from them was acknowledged, and they were told that "if they desired to visit Aden and amuse themselves with its aspects and marvels we should be glad to see them."

In the middle of March these Sheikhs and a small party of followers accordingly visited Aden, and in regard to that visit it is significant to remark that the only credentials produced by the party were Captain Warneford's letter and an Order dated 20th Shaban 1310 (9th March, 1893), issued by the Kaimakam of Rada, whereby one of the Sheikhs, Ali Abdul Karim, was recognized as the Head Chief of the district of Juban and appointed to collect the dues of the Turkish Government. Captain Warneford's death had taken place meanwhile, and very little was known of the visitors by Mr. Bury or any one in Aden. They were entertained and given small presents, but the Political Resident refused to see them himself or to make them any promises of protection. The view taken by the Political Resident both then and later upon the occasion of the visits of some other Sheikhs of Juban in the month of July 1904 was that while there was no harm in treating the visitors with civility it was to be remembered that their country had not yet been included in the Aden Protectorate, as the Turks had not up till then admitted our claim that it was part of Yaffai.

General Maitland added the words "which it undoubtedly is."

11. Last October some of the Juban Sheikhs visited the Political Officer at Dthala, when they were given small presents, with which they were not satisfied, and so came on to Aden in the hopes of more, which they did not, however, receive.

12. From the above it appears that hitherto our actual relations with Juban have not been intimate; but the same remark may be held to apply also to our relations with Naawa, Rubeaten, and Dthabiani; and the main consideration is not perhaps so much our relations with these four tribes as the relations between them and Yaffai.

13. The main question, in fact, would appear to be whether Juban is, as Mr. Fitzmaurice says of Rubeaten, so indisputably Yaffai that its cession to the Turks does or will seriously affect our prestige *vis-à-vis* our tribesmen.

14. So far it would appear that it is not; and the existence of a friendly alliance between Juban and the other two districts of Naawa and Dthabiani need not of necessity be held to effectively counteract the consideration that Juban is and apparently has been for some time past an administrative centre of the Turkish Canton of Rada.

15. At least it would seem desirable to take no action pending further inquiry by the Political Officer at Dthala into the merits of the case and the possibility of collecting and adducing such stronger evidence in support of our claims to both Juban, Naawa, and Dthabiani than is at present available.

16. Until the friction which Captain Jacob prophesies actually takes place or shows signs of seriously affecting our prestige, it would appear possibly injudicious to at present take any action which might disturb the settlement recently arrived at, and which is one which under all circumstances may fairly be termed more favourable than we had any good cause to anticipate.

(Signed) F. DE B. HANCOCK, Captain,
Acting First Assistant Resident, Aden.

May 27, 1905.

Submitted to the Political Resident.

(Signed) F. DE B. HANCOCK, Captain,
Acting First Assistant Resident, Aden.

May 29, 1905.

Inclosure 5 in No. 57.

Government of India to Political Resident, Aden.

Sir, *Bombay Castle, June 16, 1905.*
I AM directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, dated the 4th June, 1905, forwarding notes of an interview held by Captain Jacob on the 19th May, 1905, with one of the Sheikhs of Juban, together with copy of a Memorandum on the subject by the First Assistant Resident.

2. I am, in reply, to say that his Excellency the Governor in Council approves your proposal to instruct Captain Jacob to the effect that he must restrict himself for the present to an attitude of acceptance of the recent settlement.

I have, &c.
(Signed) S. W. EDGERLEY,
Chief Secretary to Government.

No. 58.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to the Attorney-General.

Sir, *Foreign Office, August 16, 1905.*
HIS MAJESTY'S Agent, in a despatch of which copy is inclosed,* has forwarded to me the Award of the Arbitral Tribunal constituted in virtue of the Agreement between Great Britain and France signed in London on the 13th October, 1904, for the settlement of questions which had arisen regarding the right of certain Muscat dhows to fly the French flag, &c.

His Majesty's Government have received the Award of the Arbitrators with satisfaction, and it gives me pleasure to take this opportunity of conveying to you the sincere acknowledgments of His Majesty's Government for the valuable advice and assistance which you rendered in connection with the preparation of the Case, Counter-Case, and Argument presented to the Tribunal on their behalf.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 59.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. W. F. Craies.

Sir, *Foreign Office, August 16, 1905.*
HIS MAJESTY'S Agent, in a despatch of which copy is inclosed,* has forwarded to me the Award of the Arbitral Tribunal constituted in virtue of the Agreement between Great Britain and France signed in London on the 13th October, 1904, for the settlement of questions which had arisen regarding the right of certain Muscat dhows to fly the French flag, &c.

His Majesty's Government have received the Award of the Arbitrators with satisfaction, and it gives me much pleasure to take this opportunity of conveying to you the sincere acknowledgments of His Majesty's Government for the valuable services rendered by you, both by the care and skill with which you prepared the Case, Counter-Case, and Argument presented to the Tribunal on their behalf, and by the advice and assistance which you were able to afford to the British Agent during the actual proceedings before the Court.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

* No. 44.

No. 60^o.*India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received August 21.)*

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram to the Viceroy, dated the 17th instant, relative to the proposed establishment of a post on Bubyen Island.

Copies have been sent to the Defence Committee.

India Office, August 19, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 60^o.

Mr. Brodrick to the Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

August 17, 1905.

PLEASE refer to your telegram of the 26th June.

Question of Bubyen Island will be considered by Defence Committee in connection with the question of eventual terminus of the Baghdad Railway. Meanwhile, His Majesty's Government are not prepared to take any immediate action in the matter of Bubyen, and they wish to leave to the discretion of His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople the question of opportunity for approaching the Porte on the subject.

No. 60.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received August 21.)

Sir,

India Office, August 18, 1905.

IN reply to Sir E. Gorst's letter of the 9th instant on the subject of certain discrepancies pointed out by Captain Tandy between the descriptions and the maps signed by the Aden Boundary Commissioners, I am directed by Mr. Secretary Brodrick to say that he concurs in the opinion of the Marquess of Lansdowne that, in view of the facts stated in Mr. Fitzmaurice's Memorandum, there does not appear to be sufficient necessity for altering the descriptions signed by the Joint Commissioners, and that the printing of the maps should be proceeded with.

With a view to avoiding delay, the Government of India have been informed of the decision arrived at in the telegram of which a copy is inclosed.

I am, &c.
(Signed) A. GODLEY.

Inclosure in No. 60.

Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

India Office, August 17, 1905.

PLEASE refer to the letter dated the 29th June, 1904, from Government of India to His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople. Memorandum by Fitzmaurice represents that revision of descriptions is not necessary. Please arrange for printing of maps to be proceeded with.

No. 61.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. Graham.

(No. 2.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, August 21, 1905.

I HAVE received your despatch No. 10 of the 8th instant, forwarding the Award of the Arbitral Tribunal constituted in virtue of the Agreement between Great Britain and France, signed in London on the 13th October, 1904, for the settlement of questions which had arisen regarding the right of certain Muscat dhows to fly the French flag, &c.

I have pleasure in conveying to you my appreciation of the able manner in which you have discharged your duties as British Agent, and in informing you that your action throughout the proceedings has the entire approval of His Majesty's Government.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 62.

Foreign Office to Mr. Graham.

(No. 3.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, August 21, 1905.

I AM directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to acknowledge the receipt of your despatch No. 5 of the 1st instant reporting on the second sitting of the Muscat Arbitration Tribunal, and forwarding copies of a statement by the French Agent.

Your action in deciding to make no reply to this statement and the terms of your communication to the Court on the subject are approved by his Lordship.

The arrangement accepted by you with regard to the language of the Protocols, as reported in your despatch No. 7 of the 5th instant, also has his Lordship's approval.

I am, &c.
(Signed) F. H. VILLIERS.

*The Marquess of Lansdowne to Professor Lammasch.**

Your Excellency,

Foreign Office, August 22, 1905.

I HAVE received from the British Agent copy of the Award which closed the proceedings of the Arbitral Tribunal constituted under the Agreement between Great Britain and France of the 13th October, 1904, to decide the questions referred to it regarding the right of certain Muscat dhows to fly the French flag, &c.

I have much pleasure in conveying to your Excellency the cordial thanks of His Majesty's Government for your consent to officiate as Arbitrator, and their sense of the distinguished ability with which you discharged the duties of the high office intrusted to you. His Majesty's Government fully appreciate the careful attention bestowed by the Tribunal upon the statements submitted to it, as also the dignity and impartiality with which its proceedings were conducted.

I have, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 64.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Mr. Lister.

(No. 572.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, August 22, 1905.

THE French Minister called here to-day and made a statement to the following effect relative to the question of the Muscat dhows:—

A certain delay was necessary in order to examine the bearing of the Award of the Arbitration Tribunal and the situation created thereby for France. The French Acting Consul at Muscat had therefore been instructed to inform the Sultan and His Majesty's Consul that the *status quo* would be maintained until after the arrival of M. Laronce, who, furnished with the necessary instructions, would reach his post by the September steamer. Action had been taken accordingly.

The French Government had considered that the maintenance of the *status quo* naturally carried with it the temporary renewal of the navigation licences previously granted, and the French Acting Consul at Muscat had consequently been authorized to once more prolong the papers of all the French protégés.

Moreover, the above measure would not in any way prevent the Arbitral Award being eventually applied in its entirety, but the inquiry which was indispensable in order to rectify the final list of French dhow-owners, in conformity with the principles laid down, must necessarily entail a certain delay, and it did not appear to be possible to permit the dhows to commence their winter season under conditions which were wholly irregular and without maintaining some control for the repression of the Slave Trade.

The French Government hoped that His Majesty's Government would appreciate the practical and conciliatory nature of the above measures and would agree to them.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

No. 65.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received August 25.)

(No. 565.)

(Cypher Despatch.)

My Lord,

Therapia, August 19, 1905.

MY despatch No. 478 of the 11th July.

Following from Consul at Jeddah, dated the 18th August:—

"Serious trouble in Assir has much diminished lately.

"Commandant reports needless to send more soldiers."

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

* Also to Mr. Melville W. Fuller and Mr. A. F. de Savornin Lohman, *mutatis mutandis*.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Foreign Office, August 25, 1905.

Sir,

I AM directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to transmit to you herewith, to be laid before the Secretary of State for India, copy of a despatch to His Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires in Paris,* recording a communication made by the French Minister regarding the question of the Muscat dhows and the recent Award of the Arbitration Tribunal.

It will be seen that the French Acting Consul at Muscat has been directed to inform the Sultan and His Majesty's Consul that the *status quo* will be maintained pending the return of M. Laronce, who, furnished with the necessary instructions, will leave for his post in the course of next month. Further, that the French Government have in the meantime granted to all the French protégés temporary renewals of their licences. This measure will not, however, prevent the Arbitral Award from being eventually applied in its entirety.

Lord Lansdowne is of opinion that the request of the French Government that there should be some delay in order to enable them to carry out the investigations rendered necessary by the Award is a reasonable one. It is, moreover, desirable to be as conciliatory as possible when so much depends on the spirit in which the French apply its terms. His Lordship is therefore prepared, if Mr. Brodrick sees no objection, to agree to the French proposal.

There does not, however, appear to be any reason to delay the application of the final clause of the Award. Lord Lansdowne proposes therefore, if Mr. Brodrick concurs, to inform M. Geoffray, in agreeing to the French proposal, that, as the Award lays down that French flagholders who are subjects of the Sultan and their crews and families do not enjoy any right of extraterritoriality, it is understood that they have now come, as a matter of course, under His Highness' sovereignty and jurisdiction.

I am, &c.
(Signed) F. H. VILLIERS.

No. 67.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received August 28.)

(No. 574.)

My Lord,

Therapia, August 22, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 547 of the 8th instant, I have the honour to transmit herewith copy of a despatch addressed on the 1st instant by His Majesty's Vice-Consul at Hodeida to His Majesty's Consul at Jeddah, reporting further progress made by the Turkish expeditionary force in the Yemen under the command of Marshal Ahmed Feizi Pasha in its advance upon Sana'a.

After the occupation of Beitel Madbi, reported in my above-mentioned despatch, the Commander-in-chief appears to have successfully stormed and occupied the insurgent positions at Beit-Muddali and Mefaq (Mifhak), and has made the latter place the base for his further operations. He has been joined there by the force operating under the command of Shakir Pasha along the Sanfour route south of Menakha.

Another force has been landed near Salif to advance via Zaidia and Kufi with the object of retaking Hajje, and then to open up the communications with Sana'a from the north-west.

The Third Division, under the command of Brigadier-General Ghalib Pasha, advancing from Taiz, is reported to have reached Yerim, which is within three days forced marching of the town of Sana'a.

These successes have been confirmed by the telegrams from Marshal Feizi Pasha which have been published in the Turkish newspapers. The Commander-in-chief announces that, after storming the rebel stronghold of Mifhak, he had captured the position of Souk-el-Khamis in the mountains, ten hours distant from Sana'a, and also

* No. 64.

another place of strategic importance named Husn Gamlan, on the road to Sana'a, the rebels being completely routed with great loss.

If the news be true, which His Majesty's Vice-Consul reports from Hodeida, that the Sheikhs of the Beni-Matar and other powerful tribes in the neighbourhood of Sana'a and Menakha have made their submission to Marshal Feizi Pasha, and offered to assist him against the Imam, the fall of Sana'a would appear to be imminent.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

Inclosure in No. 67.

Vice-Consul Richardson to Consul Devey.

(No. 94.)
Sir,

Hodeida, August 1, 1905.

THE intended advance of the Turkish army in the direction of Sana'a was actually begun on the 16th July, when eight battalions of Albanian troops, under Liwa Feizi Pasha, occupied without resistance a village called Beit-el-Mahdi, about 6 miles north-west of Menakha.

On the following day, news having reached Marshal Ahmed Feizi Pasha that the insurgents were collected in great force at Djebel Lahab, that commands the caravan route south of Menakha, from which direction it is proposed to dispatch supplies to the field army, the Commander-in-chief with four battalions descended and proceeded in the direction of the rebels. The position was stormed and taken after two days, when it was practically evacuated.

A week later, a mountain fastness known as "Beit-Muddaii," north of Menakha, was bombarded from the latter place, and which was afterwards taken by Albanian troops. In the fighting that ensued the Arabs lost over a hundred men, whereas the Turkish loss was insignificant. The troops then sacked the fortress; the spoils that fell into their hands consisted of 80,000 dollars in cash, gold and silver ornaments, and many valuable carpets.

It stated that the Commander-in-chief issued instructions previously to all his officers, that the spoils of every place captured should go to the troops without molestation.

Ahmed Feizi Pasha a few days later moved next to Ijz, and, after stationing an adequate garrison at this place, advanced to Mefaq, which he occupied without much opposition: the rebels fled in great haste, leaving behind an 8·7-centim. gun that they had previously taken from the Syrian redifs.

Mefaq is about 20 miles north-east of Menakha, if one follows the usual caravan route, and is built on a mountain that is naturally impregnable against attack, and occupies a commanding position. This has now been made the base for further operations, and contains the bulk of the advancing army.

In the meantime Shakir Pasha, with six battalions operating from Hujjeila, along the Sanfur route that lies below Menakha and along past Djebel Aniz, has joined with the Mefaq force, after forming strong outposts *en route*, to guard the transport of supplies.

Eight battalions of Riza and Trebizond redifs have been transported by sea and landed near Salif, under the command of Liwa Yussuf Pasha, who is deputed to advance through Zaidia and join the formerly besieged garrison at Kofi, under another Brigadier-General, Yussuf Pasha by name.

The latter has been intrusted with the operations in that district that have as their objective the re-taking of Hajje, and subsequently an advance towards Sana'a and the opening up of communications with that city from the north-west.

The third division, that consists of twelve battalions of infantry under Brigadier-General Ghalib Pasha, and which has with it eight guns, advancing from Ta'iz has, it is reported, reached Yerin, that is only three days hard marching from Sana'a.

According to news current at Hodeida, it would appear that the Sheikhs of Beni Matar, a powerful tribe whose boundary extends close to and all along the Sana'a-Menakha and also the Damar-Sana'a road, as also those of Bilad Bustan, Amran and Beni Sureh, came in to Marshal Feizi Pasha some little time ago, and, after tendering their submission to Ottoman authority, promised to assist him against the Imam.

Should the above intelligence prove to be correct, the Turks will not find much difficulty or encounter any important resistance in recapturing Sana'a and the other towns in the north.

As it is, the Arabs are more or less disunited and estranged from the Imam, who has so far prevented them from looting Sana'a or interfering with caravans *en route*.

In short, one might safely presume that the back of the prevailing rebellion has already been broken.

There has been a good deal of friction for some time past between the Vali, Tewfik Bey, and the Commander of the Yemen forces, Marshal Feizi Pasha.

A telegram arrived yesterday from Constantinople dismissing Tewfik Bey and appointing Feizi Pasha as Acting Vali.

The Adjoint of the Governor-General, Mahmoud Nedim Bey, has also been superseded by Mahomed Pasha, civil member of the Reform Commission recently sent out to the Yemen, and a protégé of Feizi Pasha.

I am, &c.
(Signed) G. A. RICHARDSON.

No. 68.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received August 29.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of inclosures in a letter from the Foreign Secretary to the Government of India, dated the 20th ultimo, relative to the question of a special Koweit flag.

India Office, August 28, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 68.

Major Cox to the Government of India.

(Confidential)

Bushire, July 2, 1905.

WITH reference to Foreign Department telegram, dated the 4th March last, I have the honour to inform you that I have fully discussed the question of his adopting a new flag with Sheikh Mubarek, and had it not been for Captain Knox' illness and departure on leave, I should have hoped ere this to have submitted detailed proposals for the consideration of Government.

2. I have prepared flag designs and draft articles for the Nakhodas of Koweit ships, and will show them to Sheikh Mubarek, and discuss them with him at my next visit. I shall then be in a position to furnish a full report, which may be expected at an early date.

No. 69.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received August 30.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram to the Viceroy, dated the 17th August, relative to the proposed visit of the Resident at Aden to Jibuti and Berbera.

Foreign Office, August 29, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 69.

Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

India Office, August 17, 1905.

YOUR telegram of the 2nd instant.

His Majesty's Government approve of Resident at Aden visiting Jibuti and Berbera, as proposed.

No. 70.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received August 30.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram to the Viceroy, dated the 16th August, relative to the Musandim flagstaffs.

India Office, August 29, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 70.

Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

India Office, August 16, 1905.

MUSANDIM flagstaffs: Your telegram of the 22nd ultimo.

As regards flagstaffs on Sheep Island and the isthmus, I have no objection to the course proposed; but, before any communication is made to Sultan with regard to Telegraph Island, further consideration of the question will be required.

No. 71.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received August 31.)

(No. 118.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, August 31, 1905.

TURKISH expedition in the Yemen.

I received a telegram yesterday from the British Vice-Consul at Hodeida, reporting the entry of the Turkish forces into Sana'a without any opposition on the 29th instant.

No. 72.

Admiralty to Foreign Office.—(Received September 1.)

(Confidential.)

Sir,

Admiralty, August 30, 1905.

I AM commanded by my Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty to transmit herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a report from the Officer Commanding His Majesty's ship "Perseus," at Aden, dated the 7th instant, respecting the reported German coaling station on the Farisan Island, and the replacement of the buoy at Kamaran Bay.

I am, &c.

(Signed) C. I. THOMAS.

Inclosure in No. 72.

Commander Hill to Senior Naval Officer, Aden.

*His Majesty's ship "Perseus," Aden,
August 7, 1905.*

Sir,

IN accordance with Admiralty telegram No. 10, I have the honour to report that I left Aden at 4 P.M. on Sunday, the 30th July. It was my intention to have visited Kamaran first, but, shortly after leaving, speed had to be reduced on account of a leaky tube in the port condenser, and as I could not therefore make Kamaran by daylight on Monday, I decided to proceed to Farisan Island to save delay.

2. I anchored in Tibta Bay, off the coal store in Kumb Island, at 5 P.M. on Tuesday, the 1st August.

The following information was obtained through a Soudanese seedie boy who had frequently visited Farisan Island, and I think this information is entirely reliable:—

Everything is in exactly the same state as it was when the Germans left the island about five years ago, and there is no knowledge whatever of their returning to establish a coaling station. There are no Germans on the island, and no German man-of-war has visited the place for over three years.

On the opposite side of the bay to Kumb Island, there is a heap of about 100 tons of coal lying on the beach; this was put there by the Germans when they first visited the island. The coal is quite uncovered, and a temporary wooden jetty erected by the heap is falling to pieces.

3. The coal store on Kumb Island is completed as far as the walls; part of the corrugated iron for roofing and the wooden sashes for doorways is heaped up inside. I should calculate that the store could hold roughly 40,000 tons of coal, but before it could be made use of, a jetty of at least 600 feet would have to be erected on account of the large coral reef. There is a guard of ten Turkish soldiers at Kumb Island, and I am informed there are guards on all the other islands. These men have been on Kumb Island since the Germans left it, and know nothing about the coal store being completed and the island made into a coaling station. They also informed me that the remainder of the corrugated iron and wooden sashes for the coal store was lost in a ship wrecked in the Red Sea.

4. I was greatly surprised at the size of Tibta Bay, which would form a splendid anchorage—there being no reefs at all on the eastern side.

I should think, however, that there would be great difficulty in coaling abreast the coal store at Kumb Island during a strong north-westerly wind, as a heavy sea gets up during the afternoon, which would make it difficult for lighters to lie alongside.

5. Leaving Tibta Bay at 8 A.M. next day, I arrived at Kamaran at 6.30 P.M. the same evening. Next morning I visited the Commanding Officer of the Turkish man-of-war, who informed me that the quarantine doctor was in charge of all the buoys, as the Representative of the International Commission at Constantinople. I visited this official, and he wished the buoy at the entrance of the harbour replaced, and I therefore agreed to carry out this work, as I consider that the buoy was of great aid to navigation, owing to there being no proper leading marks and the objects for taking bearings, i.e., the telegraph huts and the beacon being very indistinct, especially the beacon, when approaching from seaward.

6. It appears that the "Diana" had laid out the buoy with three anchors, using 1½-inch cables. The buoy was attached to these by two fathoms of 1½-inch chain—the cables being attached to the swivel piece at the end—and it was the three joining shackles attached to the swivel piece which had parted.

7. I left Kamaran at daylight on 3rd August, and anchored in the proximity of the reef, the authorities supplying me with a dhow for diving operations. Although she was anchored in the proper position, no trace of the cables could be found that day, owing to the great difficulty the divers experienced in working on the bottom, owing to the strong tide.

I arranged that next day as many pearl divers as possible should be sent out at slack water, and with their assistance all three cables were found within an hour, and the buoy was shackled on in the afternoon.

8. The "Diana" had suggested that the moorings should be lengthened by 6 metres, and I concur in this and would have carried it out, but there was no cable available. The "Diana" also suggested that all buoys and moorings should be examined at least once a year, but it appears that no attempt has been made to do this, although, with

the assistance of the pearl divers, all moorings and buoys could easily be examined, and, in fact, the buoy could have been at once replaced with the aid of these men.

9. The doctor experiences great difficulty in obtaining any assistance in this matter from the Turkish naval authorities, and I attribute entirely to his agency the fact that I was able to carry out this work successfully, as he gave me ready assistance with labour, &c.

10. On the buoy being replaced, it was at once fixed and found to be in exactly its right position.

11. I left Kamaran at 6.30 A.M. on the 6th August, and arrived at Aden at 9.45 A.M. the next day.

I have, &c.
(Signed) MARCUS R. HILL.

No. 73.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received September 2.)

Sir, *India Office, August 31, 1905.*
WITH reference to Consul Crow's despatch to Sir N. O'Connor of the 10th June last, on the subject of the anti-British feelings of the Turkish authorities at Bussorah and the probable causes thereof, I am directed by Mr. Secretary Brodric to inclose, for Lord Lansdowne's information, a copy of papers received from the Government of India on the subject of the hostile Arabic newspapers disseminated in the Turkish dominions.

I am also to request that you will draw Lord Lansdowne's attention to Mr. Somers Cocks' letter of the 3rd August last, remarking upon certain statements in Mr. Crow's despatch.

I am, &c.
(Signed) HORACE WALPOLE.

Inclosure 1 in No. 73.

Major Cox to Government of India.

(Confidential.) *Bushire, June 18, 1905.*
I HAVE the honour to inclose, for the information of the Government of India, a copy of a paraphrase of a telegram forwarded to me by His Britannic Majesty's Consul, Bussorah, regarding hostile Arabic newspapers printed in Cairo.

Inclosure 2 in No. 73.

Consul Crow to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 37.) *Bussorah, June 10, 1905.*
(Telegraphic.) P.
THE following Arabic newspapers printed in Cairo disseminate mendacious accounts of our action in the Gulf and North-East Arabia, accusing us of interference and intrigue:—

Mustafa Hamil Pasha's paper, the "Alem Islami."
The "Liwa"—same owner.
Sheikh Al Yusuf's paper, the "Muayed."

Turkish official opinion is thereby influenced against us at Constantinople, where these papers are sent.

I hope to send copies.

Our interests here are greatly prejudiced by them.

Inclosure 3 in No. 73.

Major Newmarch to Government of India.

(Confidential.)

Sir, *Bagdad, June 23, 1905.*
I HAVE the honour to submit, for the information of the Government of India, the accompanying copy of a despatch which I have received from His Majesty's Consul at Bussorah regarding the anti-British sentiments unfortunately now prevailing among the Turkish authorities in these parts.

2. If the Cairo newspapers referred to by Mr. Crow are such as he describes, it might be possible, as well as advisable, to prevent their circulation in Turkey through the medium of the British Post Office. The Turkish Government prohibits the entry into the Ottoman dominions of numerous papers which are comparatively innocent, and it seems to me that we might well ask the Turkish Government to include such papers as the foregoing in the prohibition. Without such authority I do not think I should be justified in intercepting them in the Bagdad Post Office.

3. By this mail the British Post Office here has received—
Five copies of "El Moaid" addressed to Agha Fattehulla, son of Abdul Rahim, a merchant at Nejef.

Six copies of "El Moaid" addressed to Ferman Firma, the Governor of Kermanshah.

Seven copies of the "Liwa" addressed to Suliman Pasha Al Zeibag, Brigadier-General at Bagdad.

4. I am making inquiries about Agha Fattehulla of Nejef. Ferman Firma is well known to me as a weak and dissolute Persian who trades on his relationship to the present Shah, and who had when in Bagdad slightly anti-English tendencies, though he formerly had the reputation of being pro-English.

Suliman Pasha Al Zeibag: There is a family here known as Al Zeibag, but no member of it is called Suliman Pasha, and there is a Liwa or Brigadier-General here named Suliman Pasha, but he is not Al Zeibag.

5. The entry of the newspaper "El Moaid" into Ottoman territory was prohibited by the Turkish authorities in 1901, and as I cannot find that the prohibition has been withdrawn I am retaining the copies of it lately received here. The other paper, the "Liwa," I am forwarding to the addressee.

6. I am sending a copy of this letter to His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople for his information.

I have, &c.
(Signed) L. S. NEWMARCH, Major,
Political Resident in Turkish Arabia, and His Britannic Majesty's Consul-General, Bagdad.

Inclosure 4 in No. 73.

Consul Crow to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 34. Confidential.)

Sir, *Bussorah, June 10, 1905.*
I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Excellency's despatch of the 10th May concerning the anti-British feeling of the present Vali. He is, strictly speaking, the only Ottoman official of Turkish origin in the place. The other prominent members of the Administration, civil and military, are all of Arab birth. It is noteworthy that two Valis in succession, Mustapha Nuri and Mukhlis Pasha, should have both been animated by the same hostile sentiment towards us. The Arabs are with us. Proximity to India, and the many advantages arising from frequent commercial intercourse with Kurrachee and Bombay, cheap education, and the possibilities of finding employment for their sons in India, all tend to the development of a friendly spirit among the Arab population.

From inquiries I have made here it appears to me likely that Turkish ill-feeling and suspicion are deliberately fostered and encouraged by some external influence hostile to ourselves. I am informed that the anti-British faction in Egypt are active in disseminating, through the Arab press, mendacious accounts of our operations in the Persian Gulf and North-Eastern Arabia.

The principal newspapers employed for this purpose are the "Alim Islami" and
[1569]

the "Liwa," belonging to Mustafa Kamil Pasha, and the "Muaseed," belonging to Sheikh Al Yusuf. All these are published in Cairo. I have not yet been able to secure copies of the articles referred to, but if they are as represented they must do us incalculable mischief. I have given directions for all numbers sent through the British Post Office here to be brought to me. It seems to be part of the Turkish intelligence system to collect all such information at the Central Department at Constantinople and distribute it thence for the benefit of provincial Governors in Turkey. I am told there are special agencies employed for this purpose in Beyrout and Constantinople, and that Cairo is the head-quarters of this anti-British propaganda.

The hostile feeling has grown more acute recently in proportion as our activity in the Persian Gulf and Mesopotamia has increased. There has of late years been much coming and going of British officials. The Viceroy of India, accompanied by a British Minister and attended by a numerous retinue, has displayed to wondering eyes some of the pomp and magnificence of his high office. The Viceregal party visited Um Kasr and were visible to the garrison of the Turkish fort at that place. The Vali's secret agents reported the ovation prepared for them at Um Kasr, and a certain obscurity regarding the object of their visit lent colour to exaggerated accounts of it which lost nothing in the telling.

Vessels like the "Renown" and the "Amphitrite," remarkable for their heavy tonnage and formidable appearance, have perambulated the waters of the Gulf and approached Turkish shores.

His Majesty's ships take soundings, uninvited, in territorial waters, and land parties for purposes of observation in remote corners. The "Investigator," of the Royal Indian Marine, lately surveyed the Koweit Harbour for several months, and the hill-side was dotted with their flags in conspicuous places.

The Admiral of the East India Station has recently made a tour of the Persian Gulf, and his appearance in force at its head gives reasonable cause, in Turkish eyes, for the accounts of a naval demonstration.

The Foreign Office at Simla last year dispatched a party of officials to travel through the land in order to obtain information for a "Persian Gulf Gazetteer," and this, apparently, without intimating their intention to the Turkish authorities, and I now hear they contemplate sending another official to Bussorah or Zobeir or Suk-is-Shiyoukh to complete their inquiries regarding Jabal Shammar, unaccredited and unfurnished with any permission from the Turkish Government.

I think our activity, supplemented by the slanderous newspaper work to which I have referred, is quite enough to arouse Turkish suspicion and prejudice the Vali against us. Our omission to ask leave for our survey and gazetteer excursions may doubtless annoy him. It is unfortunate, but I do not think it is unavoidable. Our intentions are presumably good, but our action is, I think, open to misconception.

I will take an early opportunity of conveying to the Vali the substance of the remarks contained in the last paragraph of your Excellency's despatch.

I have, &c.
(Signed) F. E. CROW.

Inclosure 5 in No. 73.

Major Newmarch to Government of India.

(Confidential.)

Sir,

Bagdad, July 10, 1905.

WITH reference to paragraph 4 of my letter, dated the 23rd June, 1905, regarding certain anti-British newspapers published at Cairo and circulated in Mesopotamia, I have the honour to report further as follows:—

2. From inquiries made through the Vice-Consul at Karbala it seems that Agha Fathulla, son of Abdul Rahim, who lives at Nejef, is a Persian subject and a native of Bushire. He keeps a tobacco shop in the bazaar at Nejef, and some say that he is much addicted to reading newspapers, while others declare him to be illiterate.

3. The following three Cairo papers are said to have a moderate circulation in Nejef, viz.:—

"Al Akhyar."
"Al Ihram."
"Al Moaid."

4. A parcel containing about fifteen "Al Moaids" went to Nejef last week addressed to one Mullah Ali, a Turkish subject.

The "Alim Islami" and the "Liwa" are not known either at Karbala or Nejef.

5. The following papers circulate in Karbala:—

From Constantinople:

"Tharwat."
"Funoon."
"Sabah."
"Jareedat-ul-Muhakim."
"Thuraiya."

From Beyrout:

"Ikdam Beyrouti."

From India:

"Habul Mateen."

From Bagdad:

"Al Zowraa."

I have, &c.
(Signed) L. S. NEWMARCH, Major,
Political Resident in Turkish Arabia, and His Britannic
Majesty's Consul-General, Bagdad.

Inclosure 6 in No. 73.

Government of India to Major Newmarch.

(Confidential.)

Sir,

Simla, August 3, 1905.

I AM directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated the 23rd June, 1905, forwarding copy of a despatch received from His Britannic Majesty's Consul at Bussorah to Sir N. O'Connor's address, reporting on the various causes to which, in his opinion, are due the anti-British feelings at present prevailing among the Turkish authorities in North-East Arabia and the Persian Gulf.

2. In reply, I am to point out that Consul Crow is himself not altogether correct in his recital of the evidences of British activity in the Gulf, and it is advisable, therefore, that the real facts should be pointed out to him.

3. In regard to the statement that His Majesty's ships take soundings uninvited in territorial waters, and land parties for purposes of observation in remote corners, e.g., the survey by the Royal Indian Mail steam-ship "Investigator" of the Koweit Harbour, it may be pointed out that the surveys conducted by the "Investigator" had the prior approval of His Majesty's Government, who apprised His Britannic Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople of what was under contemplation, and received a reply from Sir N. O'Connor, dated the 19th September, 1904, to the effect that he saw no objection to the proposed survey of the "Investigator."

4. The second point in Consul Crow's despatch which calls for remarks is the statement that the tour of the "Persian Gulf Gazetteer" party was undertaken without previous intimation to the Turkish authorities. This statement is not correct, as the Government of India obtained, both from His Majesty's Government and from the Turkish Government, through His Britannic Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople, permission for the party to journey in such parts of Arabia as fell within the Turkish zone. The only objections raised by the Porte were to the party visiting El Hasa and Nejef, and both visits were accordingly abandoned, a fact of which the Turkish Ambassador at London was duly informed by the Foreign Office on the 1st March, 1905. It will be seen, therefore, that the original programme of the "Gazetteer" party was considerably curtailed, in order to avoid giving offence to the Turks.

5. Finally, I am to say that the rumour which Mr. Crow has heard of the intention of the Government of India to send another official to Bussorah or Zobeir or

Suk-is-Shiyoukh, to complete the inquiries for the "Persian Gulf Gazetteer," has no foundation.

6. A copy of this communication should be forwarded for the information of His Majesty's Consul at Bussorah.

I have, &c.
(Signed) C. SOMERS COCKS,
Assistant Secretary to the Government of India.

No. 74.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received September 6.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram to the Viceroy, dated the 30th ultimo, relative to the proposed coal depôt at Koweit.

India Office, September 5, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 74.

Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

India Office, August 30, 1905.

PROPOSED coal depôt at Koweit. Your telegram of the 18th ultimo.

Imperial Iradé has been issued by Sultan, continuing to British Companies which have hitherto enjoyed them coaling privileges at Bussorah. In these circumstances no action is necessary, but O'Connor has been furnished with a copy of India Office letter of the 2nd instant.

No. 75.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received September 8.)

Sir,

India Office, September 6, 1905.

I AM directed by Mr. Secretary Brodrick to acknowledge Mr. Villiers' letter of the 25th ultimo, reporting the proposal of the French Government with reference to the recent Award of the Arbitration Tribunal respecting the issue of the French flag to Muscat dhows.

In reply, I am to say that Mr. Brodrick agrees in Lord Lansdowne's view that the proposal of the French Government to maintain the *status quo* until M. Laronce's return is not unreasonable in the circumstances, and he concurs with his Lordship that it may be accepted.

With regard to the grant to the French protégés of temporary renewals of their licences, it will be within Lord Lansdowne's recollection that Major Grey reported on the 19th June last that the French Vice-Consul had collected all the old French flags at Sûr from their holders and given out new ones in exchange. Mr. Brodrick is, however, satisfied with the French Minister's assurance that this measure will not in any way prevent the Arbitral Award, which had not been delivered at the time it was taken, from being eventually applied in its entirety.

I am further to say that Mr. Brodrick concurs in Lord Lansdowne's proposed statement to M. Geoffray with reference to the position of the French flagholders in regard to extraterritoriality.

I am, &c.
(Signed) HORACE WALPOLE.

No. 76.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received September 11.)

(No. 609.)

My Lord,

Therapia, September 5, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 544 of the 7th ultimo, I have the honour to transmit herewith copy of a despatch which I have received from His Majesty's Consul at Jeddah, commenting on the delay which has occurred in the appointment of a new Grand Shereef in the room of the late Emir of Mecca, Aum-ur-Rafik.

Mr. Devey informs me that the Vice-Consul at Jeddah, who is well acquainted with both candidates for the Shereefiate, is strongly in favour of the appointment of Ali Pasha, who is at present acting as Grand Shereef.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

Inclosure in No. 76.

Consul Devey to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 85.)

Sir,

Jeddah, August 18, 1905.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 77, I think I should remark that the delay in appointing a new Grand Shereef is creating some surprise here.

Aum-ur-Rafik's brother Abdillah (Abd-el-illah) is said to stand first, according to Mahommedan rules of succession, and next after him comes Husain, son of Shereef Ali, a member of the Privy Council, now at Constantinople, and then Ali (Pasha or Bey, as he is generally dubbed), who is now carrying on the administration of the Amanat-i-Jelilé to the general satisfaction of all in this neighbourhood.

It is unlikely that a reversion to the house of Motallib could be made without much opposition and sedition. Haidar, now at Constantinople, would be the claimant.

His Majesty the Sultan is doubtless well advised in not making a hasty decision and selection in a matter of so much moment, not to Arabs and Turks only, but to the whole Moslem world. People here consider the matter from one point of view only, viz., the safe quiet and good order of the province as connected with the free ingress of pilgrims. A considerable party would therefore favour Ali Pasha's immediate nomination, but others again distrust his influence and strength should he attain to the local arbitrary power of Emir of Mecca. Already, a week or two ago, he substituted Shereef Fittin, his son-in-law, as Shereef-Kaimakam at Mecca in place of Shereef Abdul-Mejid, who has held this office for four years past, and given satisfaction.

Rumours have been busily circulated, first, that the newly appointed Shereef had actually left Constantinople, with extraordinary honours paid him by the Sultan; then that the Vali of Hedjaz would consent to no other appointment than that of Ali Pasha, now gerent of the Shereefiate, and was prepared to resign if that were not accorded. Finally, there has been a report published in some French newspaper that Abdillah, on being called to the Amanat-i-Jelilé, had objected to the presence of Ahmed Ratib Pasha as Vali, and made his Excellency's recall a condition precedent to his going to Mecca. The last is probably no less inaccurate than the two above.

The month of Ramazan coincides this year nearly with November, and I believe Moslems judge it desirable that the new Grand Shereef be at Mecca before the fast.

I have, &c.
(Signed) G. P. DEVEY.

No. 77.

Sir F. Bertie to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received September 18.)

(No. 37. Africa.)

My Lord,

Paris, September 15, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to inclose copy of a note which I have received from M. Rouvier in reply to a representation made to him on the 15th February last

[1569]

T

regarding the traffic in arms at Jibuti, in accordance with the instructions contained in your Lordship's despatches Nos. 9 and 23, Africa, of the 17th January and 13th February respectively.

Your Lordship will observe that the Governor of Jibuti has reported that no case of smuggling has been detected by his subordinates, and that the French Government consequently do not consider it necessary to change the existing Regulations.

I should be obliged if your Lordship would inform me whether, in view of the attitude adopted by the French Government in this matter, I am to take any further action on the instructions contained in your Lordship's despatch No. 91, Africa, of the 24th July, which, as directed, I communicated to the Italian Ambassador, who has so far sent no reply.

I have, &c.
(Signed) FRANCIS BERTIE.

Inclosure in No. 77.

M. Rouvier to Sir F. Bertie.

M. l'Ambassadeur,

Paris, le 13 Septembre, 1905.

EN communiquant à mon prédécesseur, sous la date du 15 Février dernier, la copie des actes constitutifs de l'accord intervenu en Octobre 1902 entre le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté Britannique et l'Italie pour assurer la répression de la contrebande des armes dans la zone prohibée reconnue par l'Acte de Bruxelles, votre Excellence avait bien voulu exprimer le désir qu'une enquête fût ouverte sur des informations parvenues au Foreign Office, et d'après lesquelles les trafiquants s'efforçaient de déjouer la vigilance des autorités Françaises pour faire de Djibouti un centre de distribution clandestine d'armes.

M. Delcassé n'avait pas manqué, dès cette époque, de saisir de la question le Ministère des Colonies, et je viens de recevoir de M. Clémentel communication des renseignements qu'il a reçus à ce sujet du Gouverneur de la Côte Française des Somalis.

Il résulte du rapport de ce haut fonctionnaire que la surveillance active des autorités locales n'a constaté aucun fait de contrebande à Djibouti.

En vue, néanmoins, de prévenir tout abus, le Gouverneur de la Côte des Somalis applique sévèrement l'Arrêté, en date du 29 Mai, 1902, exigeant des marchands d'armes un cautionnement de 20,000 fr., ainsi que l'Arrêté du 22 Octobre, 1904, obligeant les boutres porteurs d'armes à passer à Obock. En outre, chacun des négociants de la Colonie qui se livrent à ce genre de commerce a été prévenu individuellement que les autorités seraient impitoyables si des faits de contrebande sur la Côte d'Afrique leur étaient signalés.

Dans ces conditions, il ne semble pas qu'il y ait lieu d'édicter des prescriptions nouvelles pour la police côtière.

Le Gouvernement de la République ne sera pas moins empressé à réprimer les actes précis de fraude qui parviendraient à sa connaissance.

Agréer, &c.
(Signé) ROUVIER.

No. 78.

Memorandum for M. Geoffray, dated September 18, 1905.

ON the 22nd ultimo the French Minister made a communication regarding the situation created by the recent Muscat Arbitration Award and the procedure which the French Government proposed to follow in carrying it into execution. The proposals of the French Government have received careful consideration and appear to His Majesty's Government to be acceptable in the circumstances of the case.

His Majesty's Government agree to the maintenance of the *status quo* at Muscat pending the arrival of M. Laronce, who will shortly return to his post furnished with the necessary instructions from the French Government. They observe that the French Acting Consul at Muscat has been authorised to renew the temporary navigation licences of the French protégés, but they take note of the assurance that

this measure will not in any way prevent the Arbitral Award being eventually applied in its entirety.

On the other hand, it appears to His Majesty's Government that the maintenance of the *status quo* cannot affect the immediate coming into operation of the final clause of the Award, which lays down that "subjects of the Sultan of Muscat, who are owners or masters of dhows authorized to fly the French flag, or who are members of the crews of such vessels, or who belong to their families, do not enjoy in consequence of that fact any right of extraterritoriality, which could exempt them from the sovereignty, especially from the jurisdiction, of His Highness the Sultan of Muscat." His Majesty's Government take it as understood that all such persons have now come, as a matter of course, under His Highness' sovereignty and jurisdiction.

Foreign Office, September 18, 1905.

No. 79.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received September 20.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram to the Viceroy, dated the 5th September, relative to the Aden boundary.

India Office, September 19, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 79.

Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

September 5, 1905.

ADEN boundary. Your telegram of the 23rd July last.

His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople concurs in view that it is very important that duty of keeping in repair boundary pillars along the Kataba frontier should be carried out by Dthala Amir. In his opinion, notification of this arrangement should be deferred until objection is raised by Turkish authorities; and then made, not by the Political Agent to Kataba authorities, but by Embassy to Porte.

No. 80.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received September 20.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a telegram to the Viceroy, dated the 5th September, relative to the Muscat Arbitration Award.

India Office, September 19, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 80.

Mr. Brodrick to Government of India.

(Telegraphic.) P.

September 5, 1905.

MUSCAT Award.

The French Government request that, pending the return of Laronce, the *status quo*, including renewal of licences previously granted, should be maintained. Laronce leaves next month with necessary instructions. His Majesty's Government will inform French Minister, in intimating to him acceptance of this proposal, that it is understood that, in accordance with the final clause of the Award, all Omani flagholders, their crews and families, have now come under Sultan's jurisdiction and sovereignty.

No. 81.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received September 23.)

(No. 131.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

RED SEA piracy case.

Constantinople, September 23, 1905.

With reference to your Lordship's telegram No. 176 of the 21st instant, I have the honour to report the dispatch of the following telegram to-day to the Vice-Consul at Hodeida, as I presume instructions have been issued to the Commanding Officer of His Majesty's ship "Fox" to proceed to that port:—

"Orders have been issued to His Majesty's ship 'Fox' to proceed to Hodeida, and instructions sent to Commanding Officer to confer with you on arrival.

"There will not be, I presume, any difficulty about pecuniary compensation, but unless local authorities immediately destroy pirate boats, this had better be done by His Majesty's ship.

"I will not press the point of the capture of the pirates, as you consider the authorities are really unable to effect it at present, but in regard to the two other points, you should accept no excuse or delay.

"Please let me know when ship arrives."

No. 82.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received September 25.)

(No. 636.)

My Lord,

Constantinople, September 18, 1905.

WITH reference to my telegram No. 118 of the 31st ultimo, I have the honour to forward to your Lordship herewith copy of a despatch from His Majesty's Vice-Consul at Hodeida, reporting on the Turkish advance in the Yemen, and the reoccupation of Sana'a by the Imperial troops.

I have, &c.

(Signed) N. R. O'CONNOR.

Inclosure in No. 82.

Vice-Consul Richardson to Consul Devey.

(No. 108.)

Sir,

Hodeida, August 30, 1905.

NEWS arrived here last evening that the Turkish troops had entered Sana'a the same morning unopposed. I believe that Marshal Ahmed Fezi Pasha, who will reach Sana'a personally to-morrow, does not intend to convey the intelligence to Constantinople before the 1st proximo, which will be the anniversary of the Sultan's accession.

The nature of the operations conducted against the rebels since the occupation of Mefaq at the latter end of July has neither been important or arduous.

The chief difficulty throughout the campaign has been a want of transport, especially in the mountains; but this has been met to a great extent by large consignments of mules arriving from Constantinople and Asia Minor, and partly by the purchase of camels from the natives by the military authorities, who have been obliged to pay exorbitant prices, and also by obtaining them on hire by payment in advance.

Various accounts of the fighting that has taken place between the Turkish troops and the insurgents during the advance have reached this town, but have for the most part proved incorrect and contradictory.

Special versions of the operations have been issued by the authorities officially for home consumption.

Suk-el-Khamis was reached on or about the 12th instant after some desultory fighting. About 1,000 Arabs, under the command of Syyed Ahmed-bin-Kasim, the Saif-el-Khilafat, the principal lieutenant of the Imam's forces, that were in possession of the above town, retired to the neighbouring villages on Fezi Pasha's approach, and on the use of artillery against them.

In the meantime, Liwa Syyed Pasha was deputed, with 2,500 men and four guns, to recapture the district of Irrh, that lies to the north-east of Menakha, and prevent an attack on the flank of the main army from that direction. This was accomplished with but little fighting.

Ten battalions of infantry and twelve guns, comprising the main force under Marshal Fezi Pasha, now garrisoned Suk-el-Khamis, while three other battalions and two guns advanced towards Buan.

The latter encountered some of the rebels *en route*, and slight fighting was reported from the villages of Gamlan and Beit-el-Salami, north of Khamis.

There was a strong force of the insurgents that had taken up a position at a place called Jahilia, which the vanguard defeated after several hours' severe fighting.

On the 17th instant Fezi Pasha reached Buan. Here the Sheikhs and tribesmen of Beni Matar came in and submitted, bringing in supplies for the troops, and promising to facilitate their advance.

A few shots were exchanged next day *en route* to Metneh (Senam Pasha) at a small village called Yazzal, situated 6 miles to the north of Buan, and near the usual caravan route, the rebels fleeing.

Reinforcements from Hujjeila and Menakha were now brought up to hold Suk-el-Khamis and Buan, and to secure the lines of communication.

About the 20th instant three battalions, under the command of Colonel Ibrahim Bey, engaged 1,500 of the insurgents, under the leadership of a powerful Sheikh, Nasir Makkoth, at Beit-el-Ma'din, 5 miles north-east of Buan. The latter suffered heavily in the battle that took place, in which the Sheikh was killed. Two guns were recaptured from the insurgents, many of whom were taken prisoners. The loss on the Turkish side is not known.

Marshal Fezi Pasha next occupied Metneh (Senam Pasha), and caused telegraphic communication to be established between Menakha and the latter place.

The subsequent operations were unimportant, the troops advancing in several directions and encircling Sana'a without opposition.

On the 27th instant Jebel Nakoum, to the east of Sana'a, a powerful fortress that commands the city, and then held by fifty of the Imam's soldiers, was taken by stratagem by the Sheikhs of Beni Matar and 1,000 of their followers, who had pledged themselves to Marshal Fezi to do so.

There was nothing now to prevent the troops entering the deserted capital, which they did on the 29th, Fezi Pasha and the main army being expected to arrive a day or so later.

It would appear that the Imam and his advisers had betaken themselves to the mountains north of Sana'a several days prior to the advent of the Turks.

The events concluding with the occupation of Sana'a may be considered as closing the first phase of the operations of the Turkish army in the direction of reconquest of the Yemen and pacification of the province.

The division advancing from Ta'iz has been inactive since the capture of Yerim from the rebels. However, its task will not be a difficult one now, in view of the fact that the tribesmen are tired of the revolt, and are daily deserting the Imam's cause.

The Ottoman Government is still pushing on the dispatch of reinforcements to this district, over 10,000 men with transport being landed at Hodeida, Loheia, Geezan, and Cumfuda since the beginning of the month.

It is proposed to bring 5,000 Circassian and Kurdish cavalry, that will be utilized in crushing the Zereneck Arabs, who for the past fifty years have defied Ottoman authority in the Tehama up to the very gates of Hodeida, and have repeatedly held up and plundered caravans traversing their territory.

I have, &c.

(Signed) G. A. RICHARDSON.

No. 83.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received September 25.)

(No. 637.)

My Lord,

Therapia, September 18, 1905.

I HAVE the honour to report to your Lordship that I took occasion during an interview with the Minister for Foreign Affairs on the 14th instant to remind his

[1569]

U

Excellency that, so far as I was aware, no effect had yet been given to my representations against the maintenance of a Turkish military post on Bubian Island, which His Majesty's Government regarded as a disturbance of the *status quo* previously existing, and as an encroachment on the territorial rights of the Sheikh of Koweit, to whom the island belonged.

I said that it was my duty to call his attention again to this matter, and to request that the guard-house be abolished, and I added that I would inform your Lordship that I had done so.

My object in making this representation was to forestall the objections that may be raised by the Porte when Major Knox returns to resume his duties as Resident at Koweit, which I understand he will do next month, and also to show that His Majesty's Government have not altered their opinion as to the status and ownership of the island.

The Minister listened to my remarks without comment, but it would be misleading to conclude from this that either his Excellency or the Ottoman Government recognize the Sheikh's claim in this respect.

I have, &c.
(Signed) N. R. O'CONOR.

No. 84.

Foreign Office to India Office.

Sir, *Foreign Office, September 25, 1905.*
I AM directed by the Marquess of Lansdowne to state, for the information of the Secretary of State for India, that the French Minister called to-day at this Office, and stated that M. Laronce, French Consul at Muscat, who had just left for his post, had been instructed by the French Government to continue to cultivate the most friendly relations with his British colleague, and to co-operate loyally with him for the settlement of any difficulties which might arise in Oman.

The French Government had no doubt that in the existing circumstances Major Grey would share these feelings, and they would be glad to learn that instructions in this sense had been sent to him by His Majesty's Government.

Lord Lansdowne would suggest that Major Grey should be instructed as desired by the French Government.

I am, &c.
(Signed) T. H. SANDERSON.

No. 85.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received September 26.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of a demi-official letter from the Foreign Secretary to the Government of India, dated the 22nd August, and inclosure, relative to the recent visit to Sur of the French Vice-Consul at Muscat.

India Office, September 25, 1905.

Inclosure 1 in No. 85.

Government of India to India Office.

Dear Mr. Ritchie, *Simla, August 22, 1905.*
I SEND you a copy of a demi-official letter which has been addressed to Major Grey with reference to a passage which occurs at the end of paragraph 3 of his official letter to me of the 17th ultimo on the subject of the recent visit to Sur of the French Vice-Consul at Muscat.

The official letter accompanies my weekly letter of the 24th instant.

Yours sincerely,
(Signed) S. M. FRASER.

Inclosure 2 in No. 85.

Government of India to Major Grey.

Dear Grey, *Simla, August 22, 1905.*
WITH reference to your last official report, dated the 17th instant, on the subject of the French Vice-Consul's visit to Sur, and the latter's attempt to borrow His Highness the Sultan's steamer for the purpose, I am desirous to inform you that the Government of India doubt the wisdom of your action as reported in the concluding portion of paragraph 3 of your letter. I am to remind you of the warning which was communicated to you in our telegram of the 27th March last, and, therefore, to suggest the advisability of exercising great circumspection in interference, without specific orders, in questions between the Sultan and the French Consul.

Yours sincerely,
(Signed) S. M. FRASER.

No. 86.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received September 26.)

THE Under-Secretary of State for India presents his compliments to the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and, by direction of Mr. Secretary Brodrick, forwards herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, copy of inclosure in a letter from the Foreign Secretary to the Government of India, dated the 24th August, relative to the recent visit to Sur of the French Vice-Consul at Muscat.

India Office, September 25, 1905.

Inclosure in No. 86.

Major Grey to Government of India.

(Confidential.)
Sir, *Muscat, July 17, 1905.*
IN continuation of my letter, dated the 12th June, I have the honour to make a final Report upon the circumstances connected with the French Vice-Consul's recent attempt to borrow His Highness the Sultan's steamer.
2. As reported in my telegram of the 2nd instant, my colleague returned from Sur in a dhow on the 30th ultimo with his wife. I found upon their return that they would not receive me when I called upon them privately, and on the occasion of my official visit of congratulation on the 14th instant M. Billecocq at once introduced the subject to which this correspondence refers, and spoke as if I was entirely to blame for the discomfort to which his wife had been put in her return journey from Sur. I asked why they had not returned in the "Lapwing," and it is mainly on account of my colleague's reply to this and my subsequent remarks that I make this Report. He said that they could not make use of an English vessel while this arbitration case was pending. I observed that this was the very reason why I considered it improper that he should have attempted to borrow the "Nur-ul-Bahar," and that I could see no reason why a passage in the "Lapwing" should not have been accepted. M. Billecocq's reply to this was that the Sultan had nothing to do with the Arbitration Case. We agreed that this was the point upon which we were not entirely in accord, and it was decided that the incident should be closed between us. A reconciliation was effected accordingly.

3. I have no information as to how matters stand exactly with regard to the assembling of The Hague Tribunal in connection with this Arbitration Case, but it is possible, if time allows, that the French may represent to the Tribunal that His Highness the Sultan's refusal to send his steamer to Sur was the result of pressure put upon him by me. I take this opportunity, therefore, of assuring the Government of India that the action taken by me in regard to this matter was limited to the conveyance to His Highness of the advice contained in their telegram, dated the 2nd May last, and a representation from myself that neglect to follow that advice might be attended with dire results in connection—and only in connection—with the

increase of French interference and intrigue in his dominions, resulting from the decision of the Tribunal being unfavourable to himself.

4. A copy of this letter has been forwarded to the Political Resident in the Persian Gulf, Bushire.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. G. GREY, Major,
Officiating Political Agent and His Britannic
Majesty's Consul, Muscat.

No. 87.

Sir N. O'Connor to the Marquess of Lansdowne.—(Received September 28.)

(No. 134.)

(Telegraphic.) P.

Constantinople, September 28, 1905.

HIS Majesty's Vice-Consul at Hodeidah reports with regard to piracy case in Red Sea, that demands for destruction of pirate boats and for compensation have been settled satisfactorily.

On 24th instant, he presented a claim on account of cargo for a British-born subject now resident at Aden.

It is probable that this man is in partnership with a relative who declared himself owner of the cargo at Hodeidah.

Consul has been instructed to settle this new claim on any reasonable terms.

No. 88.

The Marquess of Lansdowne to Sir N. O'Connor.

(No. 336.)

Sir,

Foreign Office, September 29, 1905.

THE Turkish Ambassador informed me to-day that he had been instructed to remonstrate with His Majesty's Government in regard to the behaviour of His Majesty's ship "Fox," which had recently visited Hodeida for the purpose of obtaining compensation for acts of piracy committed by the tribes inhabiting that neighbourhood. His Excellency said that the Turkish Government had already undertaken that the claim for compensation on account of these acts should be fully met, and that suitable punishment should be inflicted upon the tribesmen. In these circumstances the behaviour of the "Fox," which had prevented the landing of Turkish troops at Hodeida, and even fired blank shots at the Turkish transports, seemed altogether unjustifiable.

I told his Excellency that I had received to-day a telegram from you informing me that His Majesty's Consul at Hodeida had reported that the demands for compensation and destruction of the pirate boats had been satisfactorily settled. I hoped, therefore, that the incident was now at an end. His Excellency inquired whether the "Fox" would now be withdrawn, and I replied that I felt sure she would not be detained at Hodeida any longer than was absolutely necessary for the fulfilment of her mission.

I am, &c.
(Signed) LANSDOWNE.

o

No. 89.

India Office to Foreign Office.—(Received September 29.)

Sir,

India Office, September 27, 1905.

WITH reference to the 4th paragraph of Sir A. Godley's letter of the 4th February last, regarding a reported violation by the Turks of Amiri territory, I am directed by Mr. Secretary Brodrick to inclose, for the information of the Marquess of Lansdowne, a copy of a letter from the Government of India, in which, amongst other matters, they recommend the permanent appointment of a Political Officer at Dthala.

This recommendation Mr. Brodrick is prepared to sanction, and, should Lord Lansdowne concur, he would suggest that the Turkish Government should be invited to agree to an arrangement whereby communications respecting border disputes between the authorities on the British and Turkish sides of the recently demarcated frontier of the Aden hinterland should be made through the channel of the Political Officer at Dthala.

Dthala is not only close to that part of the frontier where disputes are most likely to arise, but would appear to be conveniently situated for communications with the Turkish authorities at Taiz as well as at Kataba. And, as the whole length of the demarcated boundary is considerably under 200 miles, the Political Officer should be able to visit any part of it from Dthala without serious inconvenience.

I have, &c.
(Signed) HORACE WALPOLE.

Inclosure in No. 89.

Government of India to Mr. Brodrick.

(Secret.)

Sir,

Simla, August 31, 1905.

WE have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Secret despatch of the 14th April, requesting an expression of our views on the proposals put forward by Major Merewether, then Political Officer at Dthala, for the grant, under certain conditions, of stipends to the Sheikh of the Kotaibis and to the Radfan tribes.

2. In reply, we have the honour to invite your attention to the inclosed copies of the marginally-noted correspondence,* and especially to a Memorandum drawn up by Captain Jacob, Major Merewether's successor, in which the subject at issue is discussed at length. You will perceive that Captain Jacob, though agreeing with his predecessor as to the necessity of providing a pecuniary inducement to good behaviour in the case of the minor Chiefs nominally dependent on the Amir of Dthala, and of not confining our subsidies to that Chief, differs from him in thinking that this is desirable only if they can produce a recommendation from the Amir, through whom the money would be paid, the object of this course being to uphold the Amir's authority in the country.

3. The Government of Bombay concur in this view, and have expressed the following opinion on other closely connected points:—

(1.) In view of Captain Jacob's confident hope that he can succeed in dealing through the Amir, they consider that it is premature at the present stage to contemplate the grant of fixed stipends to particular sub-tribes. On the other hand, they recommend that the Political Officer be given a liberal discretionary power for making occasional or periodical presents. Such periodical presents, as we understand, would differ from the temporary stipends recommended by Major Merewether only in the fact that at the present tentative stage there would be no Treaty engagement to pay them.

(2.) They advocate the stationing of a medical officer at Dthala and the adoption of a liberal policy in regard to the grant of medical assistance. We may here mention that a proposal is under our consideration for the establishment of a hospital and dispensary at Dthala.

(3.) They are in favour of no binding engagement being made either with the Kotaibi or other Radfan tribes until it is clear that the Amir is unable, with the support of the Political Officer, to consolidate his position as paramount Ruler.

* Government of Bombay, May 16; ditto, June 20, 1905.

4. We have the honour to express our concurrence in these views, which are, moreover, in accordance with the general lines of policy laid down in our Secret despatch of the 9th February last. It will be observed, however, that the recommendations of the Government of Bombay are based on the supposition that the posting of a Political Officer at Dthala, decided on last year as a temporary experiment, shall be given a permanent character, though originally they were opposed to the course which was adopted.

On the 23rd September last you were good enough to request an expression of our views, at the expiration of a year, as to the necessity of maintaining this officer and his escort at Dthala. In our Secret despatch of the 9th February, 1905, we expressed a hope that the personal influence of the Political Officer at Dthala might prove useful as a means of conciliating the tribes. We are still of this opinion, and we agree with the Government of Bombay in thinking that there is reason to expect that, if time be given to Captain Jacob to consolidate his position at Dthala, his influence may become a factor of great importance in keeping the tribes quiet and the trade routes open. It will, moreover, in our opinion, always be necessary to have an officer on the spot to watch the never-ending conflict between the Turks and Arabs on the other side of the frontier, and prevent possible violations of territory by either combatant and intrigues between them and the Amir.

We must therefore express our decided conviction that the experience of the last ten months has shown the presence of a permanent Political Officer at Dthala to be indispensable, not only on political grounds as the pivot of our new system of dealing with the hinterland tribes, but also as likely to prove the most economical policy in the end.

We have, &c.

(Signed)

CURZON.

E. R. ELLES.

A. T. ARUNDEL.

H. ERLE RICHARDS.

J. P. HEWETT.

E. N. BAKER.

C. L. TUPPER.